FBIS DAILY REPORT CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 224

18 November 1983

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

'Sordid Gimmicks' of U.S. INF Proposals Revealed AA 1
[Editorial Article in PRAVDA 18 Nov]
Shitikov, Zagladin Hold Moscow Press Conference AA 2
Arbatov Interviewed on INF, Andropov Health AA 4
[Tokyo]
INF Deployment Will 'Slam the Door' on Talks AA 6
[Komeyko in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 16 Nov]
Chervov Discusses 'First-Strike' Pershing II's AA 7
[Warsaw ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI 14 Nov]
General Rogers' Remarks on Euromissiles Scored AA 10
[Ponomarev]
Burt Confirms U.S. Deployment Determination AA 11
U.S., Soviet INF Delegations Meet 17 Nov AA 11
START Delegations Hold Plenary Meeting 17 Nov AA 11
Comparison of Reagan 50th Anniversary Message AA 11

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Shitikov on Warsaw Pact Meeting in Sofia BB 1
[Lukashin in IZVESTIYA 14 Nov]
Economic Weekly Views Results of CEMA Session BB 2
[Rybakov in EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA No 46, 7 Nov] BB 2
Meeting of CEMA Atomic Energy Commission Opens BB 5

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Turkish Cypriots' Move 'Jeopardizes' UN Efforts CC 1
U.S. in 'Utter Isolation' on UNESCO Budget Vote CC 1
Afanasyev on Afghanistan, Grenada, Peace Groups CC 2
[Vienna]
'Democratic Press' Delegates End Moscow Parley CC 3
[PRAVDA 12 Nov]

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Gorbachev Conveys Andropov Reply to Businessman A 1
'Terrorism' of U.S. Foreign Policy Depicted A 1
[Kornilov in SELSKAYA ZHIZN 12 Nov]
Scientists' Discussion of Nuclear War Reported A 4
[Vasilyev in PRAVDA 16 Nov]
Trudeau Proposals on Disarmament Talks Noted A 5
Meets With Craxi [Paklin in IZVESTIYA 12 Nov] A 5
Calls for Multilateral Talks [PRAVDA 15 Nov] A 6

CHINA

USSR, PRC Resume Exchanges of Goods at Border B 1
[XINHUA]
PRC Friendship Tour Group Continues USSR Visit B 1
Lays Wreaths at Tombs B 1
Visits University, Writers B 2
Visits Music Conservatory B 2
Meets With USSR Amity Groups B 3
Goes to Leningrad B 4
U.S. Trying 'To Obstruct' USSR-PRC Ties [Glebov] B 5

NORTHEAST ASIA

Paper Cites Alleged U.S. Role in Rangoon Bombing C 1
[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 46, 16 Nov]
U.S., Japan Plan 'Military Base' in Space C 1

SOUTH ASIA

DRA Foreign Minister Stops Over in Moscow D 1
[PRAVDA 15 Nov]
Afghan Veterans Back Revolution, New Society D 1
[Ustinov in IZVESTIYA 17 Nov]
Baku Cites Iranian 'Interference' in DRA Affairs D 2

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Paper Scores U.S. Report on SRV Workers in USSR E 1
[Kadzhaya in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 17 Nov]
Australian Women's Anti-Nuclear Stand Praised E 3
[Bestuzhev]

WESTERN EUROPE

TASS Statement on Turkish Cypriot UDI G 1
[PRAVDA 18 Nov]
Tikhonov Receives Group of French Businessmen G 1
FRG Social Democrats Expected To Reject Missiles G 2
[Zubkov]
Observers Preview FRG Bundestag Missile Debate G 3
Serov on Debate G 3
PRAVDA's Yakhontov [17 Nov] G 4
FRG Delegation Continues Economic Talks G 7
Delegation Visits Azerbaijan G 7
Lambsdorff on Talks [Mainz] G 8
Lambsdorff on Missile Issue [Hamburg] G 9
Meeting With Baybakov G 9
Foreign Trade Discussed G 10
Lambsdorff, Kostandov on Talks [DPA] G 10
TASS Cites Kostandov G 11
Lambsdorff Interviewed G 11
IZVESTIYA Sums Up Session [17 Nov] G 12
Comparison on Tikhonov Reception G 13
USSR Border Guards Delegation Visits Finland G 13
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Nov]

MIDDLE EAST AND NORTH AFRICA

Hernu 'Personally Supervised' Ba'labakk Raid H 1
Attack on Syria: Western Press 'Predicting When' H 1
[Demchenko in PRAVDA 17 Nov]
U.S.-Israeli 'Dangerous Game' in Mideast H 3
Air Raid on Lebanon H 3
[Bilyakov]
Exhibiting 'Military Strength' H 3
[Olin]
'Anti-Arab Alliance' H 4
[Vasilyev]
U.S. Will Supply Israel With Pershings H 5
[Zhukov in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 12 Nov]

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Castro Denounces U.S. Action in Grenada K 1
[PRAVDA 16 Nov]
U.S. Preparing 'New Adventure' in Nicaragua K 5
[PRAVDA 17 Nov]

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

IZVESTIYA Recalls Assassination Attempt on Lenin R 1
[Khokhlov, 15 Nov]
Comparison of Roy Medvedev on Andropov R 4
AFP: Dissident Mathematician Arrested by KGB R 6
Early Nov Republic Leader Activities Reported R 7
Shcherbitskiy Pays Last Respects to Functionary R 8
[PRAVDA UKRAINY 2 Nov]

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Early November Weather, Crop Status Reported T 1

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

TASS Reports 17 Nov Launch of Cosmos-1509 U 1
Progress-18 'Ceased To Exist' Over Pacific U 1

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Main Political Directorate Meets on Party Activities V 1

'SORDID GIMMICKS' OF U.S. INF PROPOSALS REVEALED

PM171654 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Nov 83 First Edition p 5

[Editorial Article: "Washington Indulging in Deception Again;" capitalized passages published in boldface]

[Text] "New" ostensibly far-reaching instructions for the U.S. delegation at the talks on nuclear arms in Europe have once again been announced in Washington.

The White House presents as a big elaboration of its stand its consent to setting an "equal global limit" of 420 warheads for each side on medium-range missiles of the USSR and the USA. The calculation apparently is that people who have a poor understanding of the "algebra" of negotiations will be misled by arithmetic -- 420 nuclear warheads are still a lesser number than the 572 with which the Americans intent to favor the West Europeans.

Herein lies the main deception. Attempts are being made to substitute the meaning of the talks by such playing with digits: To sharply build up medium-range nuclear weapons on the side of NATO instead of reducing the existing ones, and to undermine the existing balance. It is suggested that the Soviet Union disarm unilaterally.

The so-called "refined" U.S. option, just like all the previous variations in the U.S. stand, is not aimed in any way at looking for a mutually acceptable development at the talks. That this option is put forward precisely now and is being publicized as the USA's latest effort at the talks is aimed at trying to cover up the airlifting of U.S. missiles to Europe that has begun. It is aimed not at saving the talks but, on the contrary, at finally drowning hopes for elaboration of an agreement in Geneva.

Moreover, the key elements of Washington's obstructionist stand that have long proved untenable are now being repeated again. A direct cheating of the public is also in evidence.

That is is precisely so follows from the very contents of the new instructions given to the U.S. delegation.

They are based on several blatant tricks.

THE FIRST TRICK, and by no means a new one: U.S. computers -- and it may be presumed that the Pentagon has them in good working order -- have again "failed to detect" British and French nuclear-missile systems, whereas those systems really exist and can be seen with a naked eye -- and quite a number of them, too. To be more exact, the number of warheads on them is, by a "strange coincidence," approximately 420. The fraud is obvious, so to speak! While talking of equal limits of 420 warheads for the USA and the USSR, the USA in actual fact is steering matters to ensuring that the score be 840 to 420 in NATO's favor.

THE SECOND TRICK: In Washington they are asserting that they not only suggest equality but even meet the Soviet Union halfway since, allegedly, the figure of 420 warheads means that the Soviet Union could have precisely 140 SS-20 missiles which, don't you see, it is prepared to have. They forget only one small detail: that by naming 140 missiles which would remain in the European part of the USSR as a result of reductions, the Soviet side thus speaks about the equality for the number of warheads with the British and French missiles which now total 162 units. U.S. missiles have nothing to do with it. They should simply not exist.

Moreover, by what Washington imagines to be a clever move, it would like to get for NATO a two-to-one advantage in warheads. For the number of missiles this would be even more absurd, since in case of the implementation of that version the Soviet Union would have only 140 missiles while 420 U.S. missiles would be added to the 162 missiles, held by Britain and France. This is what "meeting the Soviet Union halfway" means in reality.

THE THIRD TRICK: Washington now tries again to replace with a "global approach" the solution of the problem of the limitation of medium-range nuclear arms in Europe. In practice this means that the 140 missiles that the Soviet Union is kindly allowed to have are meant for no more nor less than the entire Soviet Union's territory -- both in Europe and in Asia. In other words, in Washington they would like to liquidate in one fell swoop all of our corresponding arms designed for performing defensive functions in the Asian part of our country. As we see, Washington has a keen appetite. And the United States would have the right to deploy its 420 missiles wherever it chooses, as long as they are capable of reaching the Soviet territory.

Resorting to these sordid gimmicks, to deception, Washington tries to mislead people about its intention of achieving a dominant position. The deployment of Pershing and cruise missiles in Western Europe is an important element of this plan.

What conclusion follows from this political trickery of Washington? Above all, the cynical contempt of the present U.S. Administration for the hopes and the aspirations of peoples, its concept that there are things "more important than peace," were clearly revealed again. Second the indisputable fact was once again proved that Washington is purposely scuttling the talks on nuclear arms in Europe and is doing this in an unabashed manner with open malice, ignoring the protests of millions of honest people in Europe, and in the United States itself who do not want to become the Pentagon's nuclear hostages.

It is in vain that certain persons in Washington and in the capitals of some other NATO countries think that they shall be able to avoid the responsibility for preventing agreement, for a further sharp stepping up of the nuclear arms race.

SHITIKOV, ZAGLADIN HOLD MOSCOW PRESS CONFERENCE

LD171905 Moscow TASS in English 1742 GMT 17 Nov 83

[Text] Moscow, November 17 TASS -- A press conference, held in Moscow today for Soviet and foreign journalists, was devoted to the attitude of the Soviet public to problems of consolidation of security and cooperation in Europe. A speech at the press conference was made by Aleksey Shitikov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, chairman of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation. He said that the constructive course of Helsinki and Madrid is opposed by a quite different course -- the course of confrontation and war preparations, which is conducted by U.S. and NATO militaristic forces. That course is a grave threat to peace. Never before in the recent time has the international situation been so tense as now. Mankind encounters everywhere the unprecedented growth of American imperialism's aggressiveness. The recent events in Central America and the Caribbean Sea area, in Lebanon and elsewhere show that Washington has made terrorism -- mass terrorism against whole peoples to that -- the main link of its foreign policy.

Washington, which does not heed either the will of European peoples or realities of the nuclear age, intends to deploy, cost what it may, new medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe, said Aleksey Shitikov. This is a qualitatively new threat to the security of the USSR and other socialist countries. This is the first-strike nuclear weapon. This is a hostile action, from beginning to end, against universal peace.

December 1983, he stressed, might become not only the symbol of cold winter, but also the symbol of sharp and long cooling of the political climate. And not only in Europe, but also in the whole world. Deployment of new American missiles will entail a new twist in the nuclear arms spiral, so dangerous that the scale of history might be tipped towards war, not peace.

We believe, said Aleksey Shitikov, that it is necessary to fight all the time for termination of the arms race in Europe and the whole world, to fight in any conditions, whatever turn international events take.

Having dwelt on activities of the Committee for European Security and Cooperation and its links with the broad foreign public circles, Aleksey Shitikov said: Now it is necessary to step up the efforts as much as possible in order to save peace, the fruits of detente, and not to perish in a nuclear conflagration. The Soviet people extend a friendly hand to all those who are ready, irrespective of political, religious or ethnic beliefs, for joint efforts for the sake of attaining these major goals.

The proposals, which were put by the Soviet Union on the table of negotiations in Geneva, provide for reduction in the number of Soviet medium-range missiles down to the 1976 level, said at the press conference Vadim Zagladin, secretary of the Foreign Relations Commission of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee's International Department, who was next to take the floor. If, nevertheless, Washington is still going to start deploying new American nuclear missiles in Western Europe, this is by no means the result of some Soviet "challenge", as they in the United States assert, but is determined by U.S.' own plans which were drawn up long ago and which pursue quite concrete aims.

The American doctrine is based on the idea of the first, beheading nuclear strike. Pershing-2 and cruise missiles are exactly considered as the weapon of such a strike.

Vadim Zagladin said that the American side had sat at the table of negotiations only to gain time for the sake of deployment of its new missiles. In Washington they believe that now that the missiles are ready, their deployment may begin. Thereby the United States makes senseless the Geneva negotiations the aim of which is limitation and reduction of medium-range nuclear systems in Europe, in other words, the United States unilaterally breaks these negotiations.

All the proposals which were put forward by the United States, and the aim that the USSR should considerably reduce the number of its missiles while the United States will deploy its new missiles. In other words, those proposals led to disruption of the existing balance in Western favour. They did not bring any nearer attainment of an agreement.

Having recalled the Soviet proposals which were submitted at the Geneva negotiations. Vadim Zagladin said: The Soviet Union is ready to consider any other variants that would accord with the aim set, that is the aim of limitation and reduction of medium-range systems in Europe.

If the Geneva negotiations are finally foiled by the United States, Vadim Zagladin said, the USSR and the Warsaw Treaty member-countries would be compelled to take defensive measures in response, the measures that were announced. They will concern both the territory of West European countries where American missiles are to be deployed, and the U.S. territory. Certainly, after that, too, the Soviet Union and our allies would continue their struggle for universal peace, security and cooperation. But that struggle will be conducted in new, more complicated conditions.

In conclusion Vadim Zagladin said that the Soviet Union attaches "great significance to the coming Stockholm conference on measures of confidence and security and disarmament, and will be striving for success at the conference, though deployment of American medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe does not strengthen but undermines the foundation of confidence between European countries. In brief, as was noted in his statement by the head of the Soviet state Yuriy Andropov, we shall continue conducting our peaceful policy. This is our only and invariable choice".

Answering a question from a Danish correspondent about the position of social democratic parties, Vadim Zagladin said: We think highly of the activities of those socialist and social-democratic parties which are opposed to the arms race and the deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles. Many Soviet proposals in this field are meeting their aspirations. But nothing can prevent us from taking measures to strengthen our security in the face of the deployment of new U.S. nuclear missiles intended to attack the Soviet Union with impunity. We already had bitter experience in 1941 and will never allow it to be repeated.

Some Western correspondents asked whether the Geneva talks on strategic weapons would not become pointless after the deployment of new U.S. medium range nuclear missiles in Western Europe. It was stated at the press conference in reply that the appearance of those missiles would change the strategic balance in Europe with a negative effect on the progress of other talks, including those in Geneva and in Vienna.

A correspondent of the Greek newspaper RIZOSPASTIS asked about the latest events in Cyprus in the context of European security and detente. The USSR, Vadim Zagladin replied, has always stood for independent and sovereign Cyprus and its territorial integrity and against the absorption of Cyprus by any country. The unilateral proclamation of a Turkish-Cypriot state is flagrantly at odds with the UN resolutions on the Cyprus problem. It aggravates the situation in the eastern Mediterranean and in Europe as a whole. It obviously detracts from the prospects of settling the problem of Cyprus and runs counter to the interests of all the Cypriots, Greeks and Turks alike. What makes the situation special is the fact that this act of separatism has taken place at a time when the foreign occupation of eastern Cyrpus continues. The main thing today is to turn back to the UN resolution, to reiterate the territorial integrity and independence of Cyprus and non-intervention in its internal affairs, to resume the intercommunal dialogue and to settle the problem of Cyprus in a peaceful situation.

ARBATOV INTERVIEWED ON INF, ANDROPOV HEALTH

OW180031 Tokyo NHK Television Network in Japanese 1204 GMT 17 Nov 83

[Interview with Georgiy Arbatov, director of the USSR United States of America and Canada Institute, conducted in English by NHK reporter Kenichi Iida on 17 November -- recorded; place of interview not given]

[Excerpts] [Iida] Well, Mr Arbatov, now I would like to first of all ask a few questions concerning the ongoing intermediate-range nuclear force talks in Geneva currently drawing global attention. Now that the first cruise missiles have arrived in England, how much longer does the Soviet Union intend to stay at the negotiating table? Or under what sort of circumstances will the Soviet Union discontinue the talks?

[Arbatov] The beginning of deployment of American missiles in Europe means that the Americans have destroyed the foundation of the talks and robbed the talks of any essence, because the talks were just on this subject: whether it is possible to [changes thought]

By nature of double-track decision made by NATO in December 1979, the talks were just on this subject: whether it is possible to avoid the deployment of American weapons in Europe. If American deployment has started, these talks are void of any essence [words indistinct] discussing them. So Americans have killed them.

[Iida] I see. So you mean that in the very near future you will leave the table?

[Arbatov] It means not that we shall leave the table; it means that the table will be thrown away by Americans with deployment of the first weapons in Europe.

[Iida] I see. And the Soviet Union has made it clear that, you know, it will take countermeasures in the event American Pershing-II's and cruise missiles will be deployed in Europe. What are these countermeasures specifically?

[Arbatov] Specifically, the measures are intended to restore the balance which will be violated by deployment of American missiles, and they will include deployment of some missiles, shorter-range kind, in the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia on agreement with these countries. I think that also we want to consider the moratorium of our commitment not to deploy more SS-20's be void because of American deployment. Also we shall take some measures -- I do not know what specific measures -- to put the Americans in the same strategic position as they have put us by installing the weapons so close to our borders, which in our judgment means a first-strike move because these weapons have a very short warning time from 6 to 12 minutes. It depends on what part of the Soviet Union they hit.

[Passage in Japanese omitted containing Iida and NHK announcer Kimura comments on Arbatov's remarks; at the end, Iida says the next question is about President Andropov's health]

[Arbatov] You know, he is absent for a quite long time because he was on vacation more than a month; so this is a natural thing. He was very busy the whole year and he had several weeks of vacation. And this explains part of his absence. And after it he caught a cold; this is all I knew when I left Moscow. Nothing more was known. It was known that he will soon return to his office. He was working already, actually, but only not at the office. I mean that the papers which are sent to him by telephone, etc. [sentence as heard]

[Iida] You know, you are yourself a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, and I think it will usually be a rule that there will be held a plenum meeting of your Communist Party Central Committee around the end of the year, you know? And how do you think about if Mr Andropov will attend this plenum?

[Arbatov] Well, I hope that he will not only attend, he will chair this plenary session, and will be there as well at the meeting of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union which is scheduled usually. I don't think there was an announcement, but usually because this is connected with the new year's economic plan and budget for the new year. So it is usually in December of this year.

[Iida] I think that this is a very important official occasion.

[Arbatov] Yes, this is a yearly occasion, important and, at the same time, it is each year, so you can call it routine. But it is always important, of course.

[Iida] So you expect the president will attend this meeting?

[Arbatov] Well, I expect him to be back sooner.

INF DEPLOYMENT WILL 'SLAM THE DOOR' ON TALKS

FM171155 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 16 Nov 83 p 9

["Viewpoint" by Vladimir Komeyko: "Illusions for Export"]

[Text] A few days ago some Finnish colleagues showed me several articles from their newspapers dealing with the Geneva talks on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe and the statements by FRG Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher during his recent visit to Finland.

To be frank, I was amazed by the arguments and tone of some of the opinions which the minister thought he could voice in a speech to the Finnish "Paasikivi" Society. The fact that H.-D. Genscher was unstinting in his words of praise for Reagan's policy and laid the blame for the nuclear arms race in Europe exclusively on the Soviet Union is just like a daily recitation of the "Our Father" for a believing Atlanticist. But this did not seem enough for the minister, and he demanded that the Soviet Union state its proposals in Geneva. As if this had not been done in a most detailed and constructive fashion in Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov's recent replies to PRAVDA!

Even more strange in this connection is H.-D. Genscher's statement that the talks could continue even after the beginning of the deployment of new U.S. missiles.

Such an approach can only sow dangerous illusions, since the Soviet leadership has repeatedly noted that the Geneva talks can continue only provided that the missiles are not deployed. The appearance of the new U.S. missiles will slam the door on talks. Moscow will not allow Washington to speak to it in the language of diktat or while in the sights of first-strike missile weapons delivered close to the borders of the USSR and its allies.

It is regrettable that there is an unwillingness to understand this in Bonn, where the stress is placed not on the prevention of the new missiles' deployment but on the readiness to accept them on German soil. H.-D. Genscher claimed credit for the FRG for the fact that, on the basis of treaties, it has renounced the possession of its own nuclear weapons. On this ground he requested that West Germany not be threatened by nuclear weapons, in other words by Soviet medium-range nuclear means.

Let us, for the time being, leave aside the fact that this formula itself has a built-in hidden threat: We have, they say, given up owning our own nuclear weapons -- meaning that it could, after all, have been otherwise! It is inappropriate for this to be emphasized by those from whose territory World War II was unleashed, which caused the European peoples, including the Germans themselves, so many casualties.

Let us note the main point: The Soviet medium-range nuclear means are aimed not at the FRG but at the forward-based U.S. nuclear means, including those stationed in West Germany. This is neither our fault nor our initiative. The Soviet nuclear means were installed in response to the U.S. threat, and Moscow is ready to take them back on the basis of reciprocity. In connection with this statement by Genscher at the "Paasikivi" Society, there is -- to say the least -- a strange sound to the commentaries in the Finnish press which said: "It is a pleasure to hear a policy which does not resort to threats but, on the contrary, appeals for them to be averted." Before feeling pleased to hear such deliberations, it would be worthwhile recalling the history and the logic of the deployment of medium-range nuclear means in Europe, together with Moscow's repeated proposals to rid Europe of nuclear weapons.

This is also worth mentioning because some people in Finland publicized the claim that, by rejecting President Reagan's proposals, the Soviet Union allegedly diminishes its own popularity and manifests intransigence. Such a thesis is, however, inconsistent with facts. The Geneva deadlock is explained not by the absence of flexibility on the Soviet Union's part, but by the absence of interest on Washington's part in an agreement which would also take USSR's interests into account. This has been said by many U.S. experts (R. McNamara, P. Warnke, J. Smith, and others), many leaders of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, and politicians in other West European capitals.

Coming back to the Genscher visit, it is worth mentioning that he considered it necessary to emphasize his skepticism regarding the nuclear-free zone in northern Europe, justifying it by the fact that nuclear-free zones would be without significance unless others gave guarantees not to use nuclear weapons against them. Rather than saying directly that Washington is opposed to the idea, since Moscow has repeatedly declared its readiness to give such guarantees!

There is something else: Bonn's foreign minister called on Moscow not to reduce East-West relations to missiles alone but to look at the wider prospects of detente. We would be so bold as to assure the minister and his admirers that the Kremlin, in contrast to the White House, does not look at the world through the sights of missiles. Moscow has been and remains in favor of the development of detente and mutually advantageous cooperation. It would, however, be an illusion to consider that new missiles could be delayed in Europe while business life continues undisturbed at the same time. And H.-D. Genscher is perfectly aware of this. Even more so since, during his recent meeting in Vienna with our foreign minister, Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko drew attention to the responsibility borne by the FRG Government in the matter of preventing the new round of the nuclear arms race, fraught with greater dangers, into which Washington is pushing Europe's peoples. Pershing II and cruise missiles will inevitably undermine many of detente's results.

In this way, Bonn is taking vain efforts to delude itself and to export to other countries the illusions that you can have your cake and eat it.

CHERVOV DISCUSSES 'FIRST-STRIKE' PERSHING II'S

AU171046 Warsaw ZOLNIER WOLNOSCI in Polish 14 Nov 83 p 4

[Interview given by Lieutenant General Nikolay Chervov, "Soviet military expert," to APN correspondent V. Morozov "especially for ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI" "The New U.S. Nuclear Missiles -- First-Strike Weapons" -- date and place not given]

[Text] [Morozov] U.S. representatives claim that socialist countries supposedly have no grounds for fearing for their own safety because NATO is by all accounts a defensive sort of alliance that will never be the first to use nuclear weapons. Comrade, could you comment on this kind of statement?

[Chervov] Western propaganda is making all efforts to ease public concern over the planned deployment of the new U.S. missiles in Edrope. However, it will not be able to conceal the dangerous preparations that the U.S. and NATO are making with the aim of pushing the world into a nuclear disaster. The following first-strike nuclear weapons are being produced in U.S. and NATO arsenals: Pershing II missiles, MX missiles, Trident I and Trident II missiles, self-guided missiles that can be deployed on land, sea, and from the air, strategic B-1B and Stealth bombers, and the Shuttle spacecrafts.

As far as the current military strategy of the U.S. and NATO is concerned, they are striving to be the first to use nuclear weapons. This statement can be evidenced by many definite facts. Let us recall only a few of these.

In Reagan's well-known Presidential Directive (1980) it was stated that the aim of the United States' policies toward the USSR is, "to destroy socialism as a sociopolitical system, to be the first to use nuclear weapons, and to gain supremacy over the USSR in a nuclear war as well as to end the war under conditions that are favorable to the United States." During his speech at Notre Dame (in June 1981) President Reagan said that, "we will write communism down as a sad, unnatural chapter in the history of mankind, and one whose last pages are just now being completed." The head of the Pentagon, C. Weinberger, wrote in an article for the NEWSDAY newspaper (in October 1982) that "the United States does not intend to pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons." General B. Rogers, commander in chief of NATO's allied military forces in Europe, says in almost every one of his speeches that "the NATO alliance cannot abandon either the nuclear weapons that have been reserved for the first nuclear attack, or chemical weapons" (at a press conference in Hamburg in October 1982). "We cannot surrender the policy that we will be the first to use nuclear weapons" (in an interview for the West German QUICK magazine July 1983). FRG Minister of Foreign Affairs Mertes [as published] said during a speech at the Bundestag that the North Atlantic alliance "can be the first to use nuclear weapons for defense purposes."

Do not all the statements I have cited have an overt militaristic nature?

[Morozov] The West is making all efforts to manipulate the data issued by the Pentagon that states that the Pershing II missiles are not first-strike weapons because they allegedly have a "short range." What can you say about this?

[Chervov] Pershing II missiles are typical first-strike weapons. The Pentagon is reserving them not in order to defend the states of Western Europe, but to attack important installations in the western part of the USSR. It is also counting on the considerable reduction of the Soviet Union's effective activities in response to possible U.S. aggression. Pershing II missiles have a 2,500-kilometer range and are characterized by a very accurate aim. They can attack target installations in the space of 6-8 minutes from the moment they are fired. Their short flight duration brings about a change in the strategic situation and increases the threat to the USSR.

In connection with this, the threat to the states where the U. S. missiles will be deployed is also increased several times. Even in 1951 Churchill said that, "We should not forget that by setting up a U. S. base in Britain, we will become a target, and perhaps even the center of the target." Chancellor Adenauer said more or less the same thing in 1960 when he saw the danger resulting from the deployment of U. S. Thor and Jupiter intermediate-range missiles and did not agree to deploy these missiles in the FRG.

What changes have taken place since then? The politicians who are currently in charge of the Governments of the FRG, Great Britain, and France are preparing Western Europe for the next aggressive turn in the United States' nuclear strategy. As a result of this, the people of Europe will be faced with a grave danger.

[Morozov] What can you say about the state of the Geneva negotiations on intermediate-range nuclear weapons?

[Chervov] The Soviet Union and its allies, as well as the majority of the states of Western Europe are right in thinking that the results of the negotiations on limiting nuclear arms in Europe are unsatisfactory. These negotiations are, through the fault of the United States, on the brink of collapse. However, the representatives of Washington are following their own interests, and constantly reiterate that they are conducting very productive negotiations with the Soviet Union that have never been carried out by any previous U.S. Administration.

Such statements do not agree with the reality of the situation. The United States has blocked the Geneva negotiations and shows no readiness for any kind of compromise. Nor does it want to abandon its primary aims.

The West is ineffectively trying to maintain that the United States is willing to make concessions, while the USSR does not appreciate this. No concessions have been made by the United States. The negotiation of a treaty on the deployment of U.S. missiles in Europe has been proposed to the Soviet Union, and not only in Europe. Could this have been a concession from the United States? The United States is refusing to take the nuclear arms of Great Britain and France into consideration. Could it be that that was a concession? Washington is demanding the reduction of Soviet intermediate-range missiles in the West. Could this be a concession to the Soviet Union? The United States is agreeing to take air forces into consideration in the agreement. However, it wants to do this in a way that would only concern the Soviet Air Forces. What does this concession depend on? And what has the United States done? The answer is unmistakable -- absolutely nothing.

Until now, it was only the Soviet side that supported the reduction of arms in Europe at the Geneva negotiations. However, the U.S. side is striving to reach a completely different goal, that is, the deployment of new missiles on the European Continent, the continuation of the arms race, and the creation of a dangerous situation in Euorpe.

In an interview for ARD, Adelman, head of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, said that Western Europe, "is on the brink of the deployment of U.S. missiles." However, General Rogers, in an interview with Netherlands correspondents, said that two batteries of cruise missiles will be prepared for combat readiness in Italy and Great Britain (with 16 missiles in each of these countries) at the beginning of December, while the first batteries of Pershing II missiles will be deployed on the territories of the FRG. This is the end result of the Geneva negotiations, and end that was planned by the United States from the very beginning.

In such a complicated situation, the Soviet Union is doing everything that it can to reach a compromise. Soviet propoals indicate several ways of solving the problem.

1. The Soviet Union is prepared to free Europe from intermediate-range missiles and tactical weapons on equal conditions. The United States did not reply on this proposal;

2. The USSR proposes the following alternative, the reduction of present stocks of intermediate-range nuclear missiles by a one-third. The United States rejected this proposal;

3. The Soviet Union has expressed the readiness, as long as the U. S. missiles are not deployed, to leave only the same number of missiles in the European part of the USSR as Great Britain and France have at their disposal, taking into account the number of warheads. The remaining missiles would be eliminated. The number of aircraft carrying intermediate-range missiles should be identical for both sides.

What, in the opinion of the United States and NATO, is unacceptable in the Soviet Union's proposals? Would this not have been an agreement giving both sides equal rights? The Soviet Union would deploy fewer missiles and warheads on its territories than it had in 1976, -- until the time of the appearance of the SS-20's, and also fewer than 1978, when a declaration was signed by the Soviet Union and the FRG that spoke of the balance of forces in Europe. Everything in the Soviet proposals is comparable and guaranteed by a reliable control. Such proposals can only be rejected by those who are not interested in any kind of agreement.

The time has now come to make a decision: either an agreement and a considerable arms reduction, or the deployment of U.S. missiles and the unavailable, in such a situation, countermoves of the USSR and its allies.

No one should count on the fact that the Soviet Union can be forced under pressure to make concessions that threaten its own interests. "Our countermoves," Yuriy Andropov said, "will be completely justified from every point of view, as well as from the point of view of moral standards."

GENERAL ROGERS' REMARKS ON EUROMISSILES SCORED

LD172039 Moscow TASS in English 1631 GMT 17 Nov 83

["Psychological Attack on the Public" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow November 17 TASS -- TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

The NATO leaders are stubbornly continuing the campaign to justify deployment of new American medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe. They deliberately distort the USSR's honest and constructive stand on that issue, vital for Europe, and keep silent on the readiness of the Soviet side not to have in Europe a single missile, a single plane, a single warhead more than the NATO countries would have. Speaking yesterday in Rome at the annual assembly of the Atlantic Treaty Association, U.S. General Bernard Rogers, who is supreme allied commander for Europe, asserted that the U.S. renunciation of deployment of "Pershing-2" and cruise missiles would hand the Soviet Union "success at no sacrifice" NATO General Secretary Luns, in his turn, expounded on some non-existent "monopoly" of the USSR on medium-range nuclear systems. Both these assertions -- that of Rogers and Luns -- are at variance with reality.

The stand of the above-mentioned NATO leaders shows that they are unwilling, as before, to consider the problem of nuclear armaments in Europe from the position of equality and equal security of the sides.

Statements were repeatedly made in the Soviet Union, including at the very top level, on the USSR's readiness for the most radical solution of the question -- elimination from Europe of all nuclear systems, both medium-range and tactical. But the United States and its NATO allies do not agree to that. Then the proposal was made to renounce deployment in Europe of any new medium-range systems, and to reduce to approximately one-third all those possessed by the Soviet Union and NATO.

This also does not suit the leaders of the North Atlantic bloc, who raise a hullabaloo over some "superiority" of the USSR over NATO. And, finally, the Soviet Union proposed that upon attaining a mutually acceptable agreement, that would include U.S. renunciation of deployment of new medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe, the Soviet side in reducing its medium-range missiles to a level equal to the number of missiles of Britain and France would liquidate all the missiles to be reduced, including a considerable number of SS-20 missiles.

Displaying real flexibility in such an important issue, the Soviet Union made one more step, it expressed consent to have no more but 140 SS-20 launchers, that is, noticeably less than the number of medium-range missile launchers of Britain and France. All these and other Soviet initiatives show that the Soviet side displayed so much goodwill that if the U.S. Administration and its NATO allies had at least the slightest desire to have an agreement, such an agreement would have been reached just in a few days. But the NATO leaders follow a different road. They deliberately create in Western Europe such a psychological situation so as to facilitate to themselves deployment of American "Pershing-2" and cruise missiles. On the threshold of debates in the West German Bundestag on deployment of new American medium-range nuclear missiles the United States and its allies launched a psychological attack on the West European public, overtly expecting that in an atmosphere of hysteria and military psychosis they would have their aims reached.

BURT CONFIRMS U.S. DEPLOYMENT DETERMINATION

LD180605 Moscow TASS in English 0543 GMT 18 Nov 83

[Text] Washington November 18 TASS -- The United States will field its new medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe in full accordance with schedule, Richard Burt, assistant to the U.S. secretary of state, has said. His remarks confirm that irrespective of the outcome of the Geneva talks on the limitation of nuclear armaments in Europe, the Reagan administration has already decided to go ahead with the deployment of cruise and Pershing 2 missiles and that the United States is taking part in the talks only for appearance's sake.

Burt claimed that the Reagan administration's approach to questions of curbing the nuclear arms race is based on the aspiration to ensure equality of the nuclear potentials of the sides. In this connection, he hailed in all ways Washington's latest "initiative," allegedly designed to help break the deadlock at the Geneva talks. However, many experts maintain that the implementation of this "initiative," as well as all the previous ones that do not take into account the nuclear systems of Great Britain and France, would disrupt the existing rough balance of forces and would ensure military superiority for the United States and NATO.

U.S.,SOVIET INF DELEGATIONS MEET 17 NOV

LD171150 Moscow TASS in English 1143 GMT 17 Nov 83

[Text] Geneva November 17 TASS -- A plenary meeting of the delegations of the USSR and the U.S. at the talks on the limitation of nuclear armaments in Europe was held here today.

START DELEGATIONS HOLD PLENARY MEETING 17 NOV

LD171340 Moscow TASS in English 1300 GMT 17 Nov 83

[Text] Geneva November 17 TASS -- A plenary meeting of the delegations of the USSR and the USA was held here today at the talks on limiting and reducing strategic arms.

COMPARISON OF REAGAN 50TH ANNIVERSARY MESSAGE

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 18 November First Edition front-pages President Reagan's telegram to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium of the 50th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the U.S. and USSR. The PRAVDA report has been compared with the Moscow TASS English version published in the 17 November Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page A 8, revealing the following variations.

The PRAVDA version replaces paragraph one of the TASS report with "To the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium" and adds the signature line "Ronald Reagan" following the report.

SHITIKOV ON WARSAW PACT MEETING IN SOFIA

PM161227 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Nov 83 Morning Edition pp 1, 4

["IZVESTIYA interview" with A.P. Shitikov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union, by own correspondent V. Lukashin: "Parliamentarians' Great Responsibility"]

[Text] Sofia -- A consultative meeting of representatives of the Warsaw Pact countries' parliaments has ended in Sofia, IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Lukashin asked A.P. Shitikov, the leader of the Soviet delegation and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union, to comment on this event.

[Shitikov] First of all I would like to emphasize the meeting's businesslike and constructive character. The parliamentarians from the fraternal socialist countries expressed their serious concern at the situation which has taken shape in Europe and on the planet. The world is living through a very crucial period. This is why the elected representatives of the people spoke with such deep alarm about the dangerous increase in international tension and the intensified threat of thermonuclear catastrophe which is a direct result of the militarist course steered by the U.S. Administration and its allies. Only one conclusion is possible: Either, the process which was started in Helsinki and continued in Madrid will be developed further, or the black clouds which have gathered above the continent will enshroud the whole of our planet. The situation is exceptionally grave. The present arms race could prove the last in mankind's history. It is this circumstance which brought us together in Sofia.

What, in my opinion, was most important? I must mention that the comrades who spoke at the meeting said that the "burning questions" of our alarming times have been thoroughly analyzed in the statement by Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, in his replies to the questions by PRAVDA. The parliamentarians gathered in the Bulgarian capital expressed their support for the new initiatives put forward by our country and stressed that the Soviet Union has put forward a precise program for overcoming the impasse at the Geneva talks. They noted that the Soviet proposals are permeated with ideas of pooling the efforts of all people whose reason rebels against war. It is still possible to stop the world from sliding into the nuclear abyss. The main thing is to protect Europe from the new U.S. missiles. We have called on the parliaments of all the CSCE participant states to cooperate for the sake of this noble and highly humane cause.

After exchanging opinions, the participants in the meeting formulated a precise appraisal of international developments and underscored the sources and causes of the increasing tension. These, as I have said earlier, lie in the aggressive policy of imperialism, and primarily of the U.S. Government, which has to take full blame for the intensified danger of war and the violation of the principles adopted in Helsinki. Our unshakable position was expressed in the appeal to the parliaments of the CSCE participant states. It is an important document that carries a lot of weight.

It expresses the will of our peoples, to whom we parliamentarians have a high responsibility. It is the peoples' elected representatives' duty and obligation to do everything necessary to protect mankind from thermonuclear destruction. Every parliamentarian must give a clear account to his conscience and to his voters during the current November days. Of course, it is very much to be hoped that this appeal will be heard by parliamentarians throughout our planet.

There is not much time for deliberation! But we all are convinced that our meeting and the document adopted in Sofia will serve the cause of peace.

The talk with Comrade Todor Zhivkov, general secretary of the BCP Central Committee and chairman of the Bulgarian State Council, made an indelible impression on all of us. The conversation was frank and displayed real concern. Socialist Bulgaria's contribution to the struggle for peace and disarmament is well known. It is tangible and concrete.

On behalf of the Soviet delegation, A.P. Shitikov said in conclusion, I would like to cordially thank our Bulgarian friends for all they have done to ensure the success of the consultative meeting of representatives of the Warsaw Pact states' parliaments. As is known, we do not consider the security of the socialist community countries' peoples as separate from the security of the other peoples of the world. In this, if you wish, lies the main strength of socialist foreign policy.

ECONOMIC WEEKLY VIEWS RESULTS OF CEMA SESSION

PM160940 Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in Russian No 46, Nov 83 (Signed to Press 9 Nov 83) p 20

[Article by Doctor of Economic Sciences O. Rybakov under the rubric "CEMA: Integration in Operation": "Alignment With Intensification: On the Results of the 37th CEMA Session"]

[Text] As they complete the 3d year of the 5-year plan, the CEMA countries are successfully resolving tasks of further developing social production and increasing its efficiency on the basis of intensification. In this activity they are relying to an increasing degree on mutual cooperation and socialist economic integration. The importance of following this course was unanimously stressed by the participants in the 37th CEMA session held in Berlin in October 1983 at the level of heads of government.

Having approved the activity of the Executive Committee and other CEMA bodies, the session put forward a number of new tasks arising from the need to accelerate scientific and technical progress and intensify the CEMA countries' national economies. As the session's communique noted, in this avenue there are considerable reserves whose utilization will make the greatest contribution to the more successful resolution of priority economic, scientific, and technical problems.

Saving Energy, Fuel, and Raw Materials

As one of the most important factors in intensification of the national economy, the session examined questions of expanding cooperation in the sphere of the economical and rational utilization of fueld, energy, and raw material resources.

At the present time the CEMA countries have a powerful fuel and energy base at their disposal. During the last 5-year plan alone their overall production of primary energy resources increased 20 percent and is approaching 2.5 trillion metric tons of ideal fuel annually. The raw material base of the fraternal socialist countries' community is expanding steadily. The scale of their reciprocal deliveries of energy, fuel, and raw materials is increasing. Thus, in the first 3 years of the current 5-year plan alone, taking account of this year's expected results, the Soviet Union will supply the other CEMA countries with 264 million metric tons of petroleum and petroleum products, 92 billion cubic meters of gas, 53 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity, 128 million metric tons of ferriferous raw materials, and 19 million metric tons of mineral fertilizers, figures which on the whole exceeded the similar indicators for the last 5-year plan.

At the same time, against the background of rapidly growing production, which requires ever-increasing material expenditure, the problem of further satisfying the CEMA countries' fuel and energy needs is very complex. It is being resolved chiefly by stepping up production of energy sources, including via joint efforts to establish gas pipelines and power lines, and build nuclear power stations on a broad front. But the intensification of the economy and the rationalization of resource use today bring to the forefront the tasks of saving fuel and energy in every possible way. It is along this avenue that great opportunities are opening up.

The CEMA countries have already accumulated considerable experience in the sphere of cooperation in the economical and rational utilization of fuel, energy, and raw material resources. On this basis and in accordance with directives from the communist and workers parties, national programs for saving raw materials, fuel and energy have been elaborated and are being implemented.

In Hungary, for example, three programs for the rational use of material resources have been approved for the current 5-year plan. The program which relates to energy sources provides, in particular, for measures to stimulate the creation of an effective structure of energy consumption, the reduction of the quota of hydrocarbons used, and the application of energy-saving technologies. And, by implementing organizational measures alone, it is planned to reduce energy consumption in the country by the equivalent of 1 million metric tons of oil.

During the 5-year plan the GDR plans to reduce the consumption of the most important types of fuel, energy, raw materials, and semimanufactures in the national economy by 6.1 percent annually, and also to supply 12 percent of the national economy's needs for the most important types of semimanufactures during the 5-year plan on the basis of secondary resources. In 1981-1985 it is planned to save petroleum products, natural gas, solid fuel, and other energy resources equivalent to about 170 million metric tons of lignite or almost 20 million metric tons of ideal fuel, which is more than double the savings during the previous 5-year plan.

Programs for saving energy resources are being implemented in other CEMA countries too. In the Soviet Union a comprehensive program for saving fuel and energy resources and improving the efficiency with which they are utilized in the national economy for the period through 1990 has been elaborated and is being implemented: in 1981-1985 alone it is planned to save 205 million metric tons of ideal fuel, more than 10 million metric tons of rolled ferrous metal, 4.5 million cubic meters of timber, and 5.4 million metric tons of cement.

Role of Cooperation

Work in these directions is carried out by the CEMA countries in close cooperation with each other, particularly in the creation of a number of efficient machines, equipment, and progressive production processes and in the assimilation of nontraditional energy resources. A long-term targeted cooperation program for ensuring economically substantiated demands for the main types of energy, fuel, and raw materials for the period through 1990 has been adopted and is in operation. It envisages major joint measures to make more economical and rational use of energy resources in particular. These questions are being elaborated in many CEMA countries.

Promising work is being carried out within the framework of CEMA's committees and standing commissions. In particular, in accordance with the general agreement concluded in 1979, the Soviet Union specializes in the production and export of energy-intensive chemical and petrochemical products while other countries specialize in low-tonnage, less energy-intensive products, which according to specialists' estimates will save the participating countries 8.5 million metric tons of ideal fuel by 1990.

A new step was taken at the 37th CEMA Session: It examined and approved main guidelines for the expansion of cooperation among the CEMA countries in the economical and rational use of fuel, energy, and raw material resources. Among these is the development of sharing in the production of energy- and resource-saving equipment, control and measuring instruments, and apparatus for the automatic regulation of energy consumption. An important place is assigned to reducing nonproduction losses and using secondary resources. The session recognized the need to elaborate in CEMA organs a cooperation program through the year 2000 in accordance with main guidelines.

The considerable economic gain which such cooperation augurs can be judged, for example, by efficiency in the utilization of secondary energy resources. According to predictions, the contribution of secondary combustible and thermal energy resources to the fuel and energy balance of CEMA's European countries in 1985 may amount to about 100 million metric tons of ideal fuel.

The congresses of the CEMA countries' communist and workers parties have put forward big tasks in further boosting working people's living standard, including resolving the food problem more fully.

Now the 37th CEMA Session has approved a package of measures which considerably supplement and expand the previous long-term targeted cooperation program in the sphere of agriculture and the food industry. These measures envisage an increase in production and reciprocal deliveries of vegetables and fruits, and cooperation in equipping agriculture and the food industry with advanced equipment and making fuller and more rational use of agricultural raw materials. The interested countries agreed to elaborate measures for the eocnomic stimulation of agricultural production with a view to increasing reciprocal deliveries of food.

These and other tasks will be considered by the CEMA countries in the coordination of national economic plans for 1986-1990.

New Prospects

The present coordination of plans has a number of features which distinguish it from similar work in the past. The 37th CEMA Session drew attention to the fact that all the cooperation measures to be agreed within the framework of plan coordination must be carefully substantiated from the viewpoint of economic effectiveness and consideration of real potential and mutual interests.

The increased production potential of the community countries makes it possible to proceed in coordinating the cooperation program for the forthcoming 5-year period from the need to observe more consistently the principle of mutual advantage and to ensure balance in trade and payment relations. These new demands are completely in line with the strategic guidelines of socialist economic integration.

The communist and workers parties of the fraternal socialist countries pay great attention to the constant improvement of cooperation within the CEMA framework. The task of supplementing the coordination of national economic plans with the coordination of economic policy as a whole is becoming increasingly topical. The holding of a top-level economic conference, the need for which was unanimously noted by the fraternal parties recently, is called on to impart new impetus to cooperation in this direction.

Before the start of the 37th CEMA Session in Berlin, a meeting of heads of delegations and secretaries of the Central Committees of CEMA countries' communist and worker parties was held. This meeting examined questions of preparations for the top-level economic conference. Preparations for such a conference have essentially been completed.

Speaking at the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum, Comrade Yu. V. Andropov noted that we are striving "for a qualitatively new level of economic integration. Even today it is impossible to imagine the life of the socialist community countries without this. In the future integration will become increasingly deep, all-embracing, and effective, reliably ensuring the strengthening of the member countries' national economies. This is what our joint efforts are aimed at."

The fraternal socialist countries favor the active development of economic ties with all countries of the world. They attach special significance to cooperation with the developing states. Within the framework of mutual relations with them, the CEMA member countries actively and consistently support their course of developing their economies and thereby ensuring their economic independence and national sovereignty. And it is indicative that representatives of Angola, Afghanistan, the PDRY, Laos, Mozambique, and Ethiopia took part as observers in the work of the 37th CEMA Session.

The 37th session noted the importance of the foreign policy initiatives put forward in the 1983 Prague Political Declaration of the Warsaw Pact States and the joint statement by leading party and state figures of the socialist countries in Moscow. The communique of the 37th CEMA Session reaffirmed the determination of the CEMA countries not to slacken their efforts aimed at improving international political and economic relations.

MEETING OF CEMA ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION OPENS

LD151049 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 15 Nov 83

[Text] The Standing Atomic Energy Commission of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance has convened for a conference in Moscow to discuss the prospects of cooperation in the current decade. In the period in question atomic power plants whose capacity totals 37,000,000 kw are to be built with Soviet aid in East European socialist countries and on Cuba. Many of these plants will have power units whose capacity will amount to 1,000,000 kw.

TURKISH CYPRIOTS' MOVE 'JEOPARDIZES' UN EFFORTS

LD180030 Moscow TASS in English 1807 GMT 17 Nov 83

[Text] New York November 17 TASS -- The United Nations Security Council has embarked on the discussion of the problem of Cyprus where the leadership of the Turkish community has taken a separatist action by declaring the creation of an "independent state" in the northern part of the island. This step utterly contradicts the decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations which came out many times for the respect of sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and the policy of non-alignment of United Cyprus.

Speaking at the meeting of the Security Council, United Nations Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar said that the proclamation of the "independent state" in the north of Cyprus jeopardizes the efforts of the United Nations aimed at resuming serious talks between the two communities and at achieving a peaceful and just settlement of the conflict.

U.S. IN 'UTTER ISOLATION' ON UNESCO BUDGET VOTE

LD171638 Moscow TASS in English 1541 GMT 17 Nov 83

[Text] Paris November 17 TASS -- Voting on the question of level of UNESCO's budget for 1984-1985 has ended with a result which has confirmed the striving of an overwhelming majority of UNESCO member states to ensure a constructive activity of this authoritative international organisation. A budget level of about 375 million dollars has been adopted by 126 votes to one. The United States was the only state to vote against. Thereby Washington, which sought to curtail programs intended for aid in the development of education, science and culture of the developing countries, found itself in full isolation. Only ten countries, among them some NATO members, supported the suggested level of the UNESCO budget.

Yuriy Khilchevskiy, permanent representative of the USSR at the UNESCO, made a speech at the plenary meeting of the 22nd session of the UNESCO's general conference. He pointed out that the results of the voting are the more important as they are achieved in a complex situation contrary to deliberate endeavours by certain states to hinder the UNESCO's constructive activities and to disrupt the normal course of its work. The USSR delegation expresses support for the UNESCO's draft programme and a draft budget for 1984-1985. The approval of the proposal proceeds from the political importance and universal usefulness of the UNESCO's lofty activities aimed at developing multilateral international cooperation in the interests of all states and at strengthening a climate of peace and security on earth.

This session, Yuriy Khilchevsky has pointed out in an interview with a TASS correspondent, has shown that during the discussion of, it would seem, a purely financial question, two tendencies of approach to the UNESCO's activities manifested themselves.

The first of them is characterized by the striving to mobilise resources for organizing aid to the developing countries in the cause of the development of science, education and culture with due regard for the difficulties being experienced by them. Characteristic of this tendency is also the striving to secure that UNESCO not stay away from the solution of the acutest problem of our time -- the ensurance of international security and peace and termination of the arms race.

The second tendency is an attempt to curtail the UNESCO's activities and to put barriers in the path of progress. Financial levers were counted upon in such endeavour.

The first tendency which is a reflection of reason has prevailed. Through the efforts of the developing countries and socialist states, a rebuff was given to the U.S. political blackmail. The USA, as the voting has shown, found itself in utter isolation and did not get support even from its closest NATO allies. The U.S. delegation's attempts at softening the effect of the voting failed. Representatives of all the regions of the world sharply criticized the U.S. stand. Significant in this connection is a statement by Ina Der Thiam, Senegalese minister of national education, who pointed out that voting on the UNESCO's budget is the touchstone of the attitude of the international organization and individual countries to the urgent needs of the developing countries. The Soviet representative stressed that the developing countries highly appreciated the stand of socialist states and condemned the policy of sabotage on the part of the USA.

AFANASYEV ON AFGHANISTAN, GRENADA, PEACE GROUPS

AU161129 Vienna Domestic Service in German 0612 GMT 16 Nov 83

[Interview given by PRAVDA chief editor Viktor Afanasyev to Harry Sichrowski in Vienna -- date not given; recorded; Afanasyev answers in Russian with superimposed German translation]

[Text] [Sichrowski] Mr Chief Editor Afanasyev, Europe finds itself at present in a crisis caused by the missile armament which most seriously threatens peace. But, on the other hand, peace is equally threatened by the policy of the superpowers which claim for themselves the right to pursue their interests without regard for the small countries. For many peace fighters, the same pattern seems to exist in Grenada and Afghanistan. What is your opinion?

[Afanasyev] I will begin my reply with the last point of your question: I am of the opinion that one simply cannot compare these two countries, Afghanistan and Grenada. We were asked 13 times to render aid in Afghanistan and only after the 14th time did we agree to do so. And according to Article 50 of the UN Charter it is legal to render aid to another state requesting such aid. We have a treaty stipulating the statute of the Soviet troop contingent in Afghanistan. Our soldiers are in Afghanistan only because an undeclared war is being waged in Afghanistan by the United States, by other states. As soon as this undeclared war ends, the troop contingents of the Soviet Union will be immediately withdrawn. And one cannot but point out that we have a common border of over 2,000 kilometers with Afghanistan, that this country has always been friendly toward us, and we are certainly interested in ensuring that this country also remains independent and peaceful toward us.

If you look at Grenada, you will see that this is quite a different matter. It is a small country, over 1,400 miles away from the United States. One can hardly say that any interests, security interests, of the United States have been harmed in this country. And to use against this country 15,000 soldiers with helicopters, airplanes, and other military equipment -- it is my firm conviction that you cannot regard these two cases as being the same.

And now the question about the superpowers: Personally, I do not think that the big powers are of the same kind. We are a socialist country, and therefore peaceful. We have paid dearly for this peace, with 20 million war casualties. We do not want something similar to occur again; all we want is to remain strong so as to be able to defend ourselves. And I do not agree at all with the assertion that we and the Warsaw Pact are ignoring the interests of the smaller countries. Our very relations with Austria are a good example showing that we do not in any way ignore the interests of small countries in our policy toward these countries.

[Sichrowski] You are also a leading functionary of the Soviet peace movement. The Soviet Union and its allies support the peace movement in the West. But one hears again and again that in your country any independent peace movement is persecuted on the strength of the argument that the official government policy is a policy of peace anyhow, and that there is no need for such a movement.

[Afanasyev] I cannot agree, either, with the assertion that there is an independent peace movement in the Soviet Union. What this is all about is actually a handful of people -- 10, 15, no more -- among them also a few criminal types, who actually have only one aim: to assert their private, personal interests, and who to this end are abusing the emotions for peace, the longing for peace. The problem of the so-called independent peace movement has been thought up, made up, and developed by the West and has nothing whatsoever to do with the reality in the Soviet Union. We absolutely do not have this problem.

[Sichrowski] You are the chief editor of one of the world's largest newspapers. Here is another argument by the West: that the Soviet public is essentially being supplied only with one-sided information, and that it can acquaint itself always only with one position -- the official Soviet position -- and that this is not conducive to the peace dialogue between East and West.

[Afanasyev] I believe that the West clearly misjudges the nature, the content, and the substance of our newspaper. We are in fact the official organ of the CPSU, we are a party organ, and we do not want to hush this up. That is why we are sometimes politically biased, that is why we seek to defend the interests of our party and of our state on the pages of our newspaper. Naturally, try not to [words indistinct] our newspaper, which could harm our state, we are not running after sensations, we are not printing any false reports as a matter of principle. Naturally, we also have shortcomings, we sometimes have a considerable backlog in the [word indistinct] publication of this or that news, we are frequently slower than the Western press, but we are trying to to everything to present an objective picture of world events in our newspaper.

DEMOCRATIC PRESS' DELEGATES END MOSCOW PARLEY

PM151257 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Nov 83 First Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "Meeting Concluded"]

[Excerpts] A meeting of representatives of the democratic press who attended the celebrations for the 66th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution -- editors of communist and revolutionary-democratic newspapers and journals -- concluded its work 10 November. The meeting was held in a warm, comradely atmosphere and in a spirit of internationalist solidarity among communists and revolutionary democrats in the struggle against the danger of war and imperialism's aggressive plans and actions. To conclude the meeting B.N. Ponomarev, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, wished its participants successes in their difficult and responsible work for the good of their peoples and in the struggle for the lofty aims which inspire communists and revolutionary democrats. On behalf of the CPSU Central Committee he asked that best fraternal wishes be conveyed to the parties represented at the meeting so timely and useful for everyone and for the truly Leninist internationalism of Soviet Communists, to whom the decisive role in the common struggle for peace and socialism belongs.

GORBACHEV CONVEYS ANDROPOV REPLY TO BUSINESSMAN

LD171955 Moscow TASS in English 1645 GMT 17 Nov 83

[Russian in second paragraph supplied from Moscow Television newscasts at 1645 and 1800 GMT and Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1900 GMT on 17 November]

[Text] Moscow November 17 TASS -- Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev received well-known American businessman and public figure John Crystal now on a visit to the Soviet Union.

Mikhail Gorbachev conveyed to John Crystal the oral answer [ustnyy otvet] of President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Yuriy Andropov to the address of the editor of DES MOINES REGISTER newspaper in which Yuriy Andropov thanked the author of the address for the invitation to visit the State of Iowa and reports that he shares the sentiments of anxiety over the situation in the world, the state of relations between the United States and the USSR.

In his answer Yuriy Andropov stressed that the Soviet Union has always been striving to live in peace with all the states, to develop mutually beneficial cooperation also with the United States, including such a creative sphere as agriculture. If the present-day tension between the USSR and the USA exists and stands in the way of cooperation, this is by no means the result of the Soviet Union's policy.

The Soviet Government, our people, Yuriy Andropov stresses in his answer, would continue doing the utmost to lessen international tension, to improve the relations between the USSR and the United States. But to attain realistic progress in that important sphere it is necessary to have goodwill and efforts of the other side -- the government of the United States.

Yuriy Andropov conveyed to THE DES MOINES REGISTER editor and, through his newspaper to the residents of the State of Iowa, all American farmers good wishes of success in their labor, useful for soceity.

In the course of the talk Mikhail Gorbachev and John Crystal touched upon a number of questions of the present-day dangerous international situation and relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. Mikhail Gorbachev briefed the guest on implementation of the food programme, measures of developing the country's agri-industrial complex, measures aimed at further improving the living standards of the Soviet people.

In discussing other questions, including contacts in the sphere of agricultural production, Mikhail Gorbachev and John Crystal expressed the opinion that there are vast potentialities for mutually beneficial cooperation. Realization of these potentialities largely depends on the state of Soviet-American relations as a whole. [Moscow Television in Russian newscasts here add: "USSR Agriculture Minister Comrade Mesyats was present during the conversation."]

'TERRORISM' OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY DEPICTED

PM151500 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 12 Nov 83 p 3

[Political observer Yu. Kornilov "View of Events": "Course of Terror"]

[Text] Such a thing has probably not happened before in modern international relations!

Whereas before Washington, whose polciy is determined by the incessant imperial ambitions and hegemonist lust of the most reactionary U.S. imperialist circles, nonetheless tried to assert that the United States was "not party" to operations aimed at overthrowing legitimate governments, today, when the U.S. military is tramping on Grenadian soil, these operations are publicly declared "legitimate." Back on the eve of the invasion, on 20 October, U.S. President Reagan announced that "clandestine operations are part and parcel of the authorities' activities." Developing the President's "creed," CIA Director W. Casey declared that "the United States must make a point of invading any developing country where revolutionary changes threaten U.S. interests." The occupation of Grenada has demonstrated to the entire world that these brazen statements are not simply irresponsible and belligerent rhetoric but that international piracy and terrorism have indeed, and moreover quite officially, been elevated in Washington to the level of state policy.

So what are the sociogeographic parameters of this criminal policy; what is the scale of the Washington-organized bandit actions, whose aim is to establish U.S. diktat over sovereign countries and peoples? We will not summon up history, which testifies that in the last 6 years alone the United States has resorted to armed actions against sovereign states or threatened them with the use of force 38 times. Let us look at present-day facts.

Central and Latin America

Having occupied Grenada, the United States is continuing its aggressive actions against another of the region's independent countries -- Nicaragua. Dozens of U.S. warships are lying off Nicaragua's shores, major U.S. Army combat contingents have been moved into neighboring Honduras on the pretence of exercises, and thousands of professional mercenaries armed with U.S. weapons whose actions are directed and coordinated by the CIA are being sent into Nicaraguan territory. Simultaneously, Washington is continuing the escalation of unprecedentedly brazen threats leveled at revolutionary Cuba, is arming and succoring the military dictatorship in El Salvador which is waging a war against its own people, patronizes the bloody Fascist junta usurping power in Chile, and is guardian of the executioners and tyrants in Quatemala, Paraguay, Haiti....

The Near East

Here the United States is an outright accomplice in the policy of aggression, genocide, and repression that is being pursued against the Palestinians and the other Arabs by the rules of Israel, an accomplice in their colonial activity in the seized Arab lands and their atrocities on the soil of long-suffering Lebanon. Continuing the policy of strengthening in every way possible the "strategic alliance" with the Zionist aggressor and exploiting the tension that has arisen as a result of Israeli aggression against Lebanon and the subsequent introduction of U.S. troops there, Washington is striving to expand and consolidate the U.S. military presence in the region. Acting in league with Tel Aviv, the United States is threatening Syria and blatantly flouting Lebanon's sovereignty and independence.

Asia

The peaceful and constructive initiatives by the Soviet Union, Mongolia, Vietnam, and other countries aimed at turning Asia into a continent of peace and good-neighborly cooperation are countered by the U.S. Administration with a dangerous policy of militarizing the region's countries, interfering in the internal affairs of soverign countries, and fanning tension among Vietnam, Laos, and Kampuchea on the one hand and the ASEAN states on the other.

The United States unleashed and is continuing an "undeclared war" against sovereign Afghanistan. Under the leadership of the U.S. special services a whole network of camps and bases has been created in Pakistan at which, under CIA leadership, anti-Afghan bandit formations are trained and equipped and then transferred to the DRA, where they kill peaceful inhabitants, burn down hospitals and mosques, and blow up bridges and roads. South Korea has been virtually occupied by the United States and turned into a test range for the Pentagon. U.S. President Reagan is currently holding secret talks which are clearly militarist in character in this region.

Africa

Acting as guardian to the South African racists, the United States has turned the criminal Pretoria regime into the main instrument of its hegemonist policy on the continent. Washington is a de facto accomplice in South Africa's incessant armed provocations against Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, and Zambia. The United States is encouraging the use of white mercenaries against the Seychelles and the Comoros, raids by the regular racist army against Lesotho, and the deliberate delaying of the declaration of Namibian independence. At the opposite and of the continent, in Northest Africa, Washington has enmeshed a huge region in its network of military bases called upon to control the approaches to the rich oil-bearing regions of the Near East. The U.S. Rapid Deployment Force maneuvers recently held on the territory of Sudan, Somalia, and Oman were yet another crude show of strength aimed against the progressive regimes of Libya. Ethiopia, and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen. U.S. interference in the affairs of the Republic of Chad continues.

Playing the role of a unique kind of guarantor of the international system of exploitation and oppression and striving to impose their diktat on entire regions of the world, the U.S. ruling circles have publicly declared an "enemy of Amercia" the Nonaligned Movement, in which more than 100 states with a total population of 1.5 billion people participate! From the rostrum of the UN General Assembly session Reagan called the Nonaligned Movement a "pseudo-nonaligned movement," slanderously accusing dozens of UN member states of allegedly "siding with aggression." And these "accusations," if they can be called that, come from the president of a country whose ruling circles openly consider force, piracy, and bloody terror as virtually the only instrument of their foreign policy!

In short, it is more than obvious that Reagan's "crusade," while primarily against socialism, is simultaneously aimed at evertyhing freedom-loving and progressive that exists in the modern world. We are talking about a global doctrine of international gangsterism and Washington's attempts to arrogate -- on what basis is unknown -- the role of some kind of supreme judge over sovereign countries and peoples, and the cynical and hegemonist claim to indulge in tyranny and lawlessness in international affairs. As Yu.V. Andropov's statement notes, "Under cover of anticommunism the would-be arbiters of the world's fate try to install systems that suit them wherever they do not meet with a rebuff."

Need it be said that this imperial policy and Washington's practical actions, which are steeped in hegemonism, constitute the most blatant violation of the UN Charter and the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act?

Washington's hegemonist pretensions also extend to the U.S. NATO allies also, who are increasingly being allotted the role of dumb pawns in the dangerous militarist game that Reagan and company are playing in the international arena. Is this not evidenced by the fact that Washington, brazenly ignoring the demands of the broadest European public, is stubbornly seeking to deploy on West European soil almost 600 new U.S. Pershing and cruise missiles, which will mean turning West Europe into a potential "theater of military action" and the Pentagon's nuclear hostage? And what can be said about Washington's line of encouraging the rebirth of Japanese militarism and the transformation of Japan into a U.S. "unsinkable nuclear aircraft carrier?" U.S. imperialism -- the incarnation of the 20th century's blackest reaction -- is today the main source of the fueling of international tension and the bearer of a serious threat to the peace and security of all the peoples.

But the imperial lust of the U.S. imperialist circles and their capabilities are far from one and the same thing. The more bare-faced the aggressive essence of Washington's foreign policy becomes, the more resolute the rebuff given to this dangerous policy by sovereign states and peoples: Let us recall in this connection that 108 UN member countries unequivocally condemned the U.S. aggression against Grenada, and the international public unanimously branded this gangster act as a crime against peace and humanity. The U.S. policeman policy in the international arena is a discredited policy pursued with discredited means. Each day that this doomed policy continues increases the burden of shame and dishonor that the "Reagan team" has dumped on its country.

Imperialism is being eaten away on all sides -- by the fact that the peoples of the socialist states are successfully building the new society, the international workers' movement and the national liberation struggle are acquiring increasingly broad scope, and the countries liberated from the colonial yoke are, despite fierce U.S. opposition, moving forward along the road of national revival and social progress. "Curb the U.S. aggressor and put an end to Washington's tyranny and lawlessness!" is the people's unanimous demand.

SCIENTISTS' DISCUSSION OF NUCLEAR WAR REPORTED

PM171046 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 83 First Edition p 5

[Dispatch by own correspondent G. Vasilyev: "Scientists' Imposing Word; Television Dialogue Across the Ocean"]

[Text] Washington, Nov -- A conference on the subject "The World After a Nuclear War" has been held over several days in the conference hall of the capital's Washington Sheraton Hotel. Eminent U.S. scientists -- physicists, biologists, meteorologists, and representatives of public organizations -- gathered here. They gathered despite pressure from the U.S. Administration, which accuses the opponents of the arms race of "betraying national interests." They gathered to determine scientifically the worldwide biological consequences of nuclear war.

The screen showed our planet, toward which a dark cloud was advancing, spreading over its entire surface. Diagrams showed how far the dust raised by a nuclear blast will cover the sky, blocking the sun's rays. Charts showed a sharp drop in temperature on the earth's surface and a steep increase in the level of radiation. The reports' language was precise, their conclusion was terrible: Those who do not die in the first minutes of a "nuclear exchange" can expect no better a fate.

"Nuclear war," Stanford University Professor Paul Erlich, a biologist, said, "will face all those who survive with extreme cold, hunger, a lack of clean water, and radioactive contamination. The environment in which most people will find themselves after a thermonuclear catastrophe will be so hostile that grave damage to life systems will be inevitable. We cannot rule out the possibility that mankind will perish completely. The data brought to the attention of the conference participants are the results of 2 years' research by dozens of eminent scientists in the United States and other countries."

The next speaker, Cornell University Professor Carl Sagan, an astronomer, announced that, having rehearsed various nuclear war "scenarios" on computers, scientists discovered that previous studies of the consequences of the possible use of nuclear weapons, particularly the official studies published in the United States, have been marked by a characteristic vagueness -- they resolutely underplayed the fatal consequences of the planned "limited" nuclear war.

The eminent geophysicist Thomas Malone, the well-known biologist Donald Kennedy, the renowned astronomer Walter Orr Roberts, and the ecologist George Woodwell spoke. The floor was given to the guest Soviet scientists -- the mathematician N.N. Moiseyev, G.S. Golitsin, a specialist in atmospheric physics, and V.V. Aleksandrov, representative of the USSR Academy of Sciences Computer Center. People speak different languages, using different scientific methods, but their conclusions coincide. Nuclear war would be a catastrophe for mankind.

The conference finale was impressive. A transcontinental Moscow-Washington link was set up via satellite. On the screen were Soviet scientists -- academicians Ye. Velikhov, R. Sagdeyev, and A. Bayev; N. Bochkov, member of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences; Yu. Israel, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Control, and others. A dialogue began across the enormous distance. Brief reports, questions, answers, the exchange of information. And again the scientists' conclusions did not differ on the main thing. Nuclear war would cause irreparable damage to our planet and to life on earth.

"Once, addressing the U.S. National Academy of Sciences, President Lincoln wrote that it is the duty of scientists to give advice to the government," Walter Orr Roberts said. "We have voiced our opinion. Let's hope that the political leaders consider our conclusions careful and act in accordance with reality."

The scientific conference "The World After a Nuclear War" has been held here under conditions where the U.S. Administration, having embarked on the path of an unprecedented arms race and military adventures abroad, is spurring on militarist, chauvinist, great-power feelings inside the country. The conference has shown that the thunder of the military drums cannot muffle the voice of reason.

TRUDEAU PROPOSALS ON DISARMAMENT TALKS NOTED

Meets With Craxi

PM161045 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Nov 83 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent N. Paklin dispatch under the general rubric "Topical Themes": "Italy: The Stakes Have Not Changed"]

[Text] Rome -- At a meeting with the head of the Italian Government, B. Craxi, Canadian Prime Minister P. Trudeau, currently on a visit to Italy, has expressed himself in favor of "a resumption of the East-West dialogue at all levels with the aim of restoring mutual trust.

P. Trudeau has called on NATO member countries to use the upcoming December session of the Atlantic bloc to impart new impetus to the Geneva and Vienna talks. However, one gets the impression here that the United States' NATO allies are unable to stand up to the pressure of the U.S. Administration, which is gambling on the deployment of new nuclear missiles in West Europe. Speaking at a press conference in Rome, R. Burt, U.S. assitant secretary of state, confirmed, for instance, that "the new U.S. nuclear missiles will be deployed in West Europe before the end of this year, as envisaged in the corresponding Nato program." In his turn, Italian Defense Minister G. Spadolini confirmed that the first batch of cruise missiles will arrrive at the Sigonella (Sicily) U.S. military base in the near future.

Calls for Multilateral Talks

PM160835 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Nov 83 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "P . Trudeau speech"]

[Text] Ottawa, 14 Nov -- Canadian Prime Minister P. Trudeau, speaking in Montreal, has put forward a "program for a global, all-embracing approach to alleviating the present tense situation in the world."

The Canadian prime minister stated that it is necessary to step up efforts aimed at curbing the arms race, above all the nuclear arms race. He spoke out, in particular, for extending the framework of the current talks on this question by involving the other nuclear powers -- Britain, France, and China. Concrete measures to establish global limits on the five nuclear powers' nuclear arsenals, P. Trudeau said, could be elaborated at an authoritative international forum, which could be convened as early as next year for that purpose. Here he stressed that "the rights of the Soviet Union and the United States as powers equal to each other in strategic terms" must be acknowledged. After establishing the relative level of armaments, the five nuclear powers could embark on examining measures for arms reduction and for control over "qualitative aspects of the strategic arms race."

P. Trudeau proposed strengthening the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to which a number of states that have the potential for creating nuclear weapons have not yet acceded. He came out in favor of a reduction in conventional arms and armed forces to a "mutually agreed level" by the NATO and Warsaw Pact member countries in Vienna on this question. The prime minister also advocated "banning tests and deployment of antisatellite systems."

USSR, PRC RESUME EXCHANGES OF GOODS AT BORDER

OW161820 Beijing XINHUA Domestic Service in Chinese 1722 GMT 16 Nov 83

[Text] Ili, 16 Nov (XINHUA) -- A ceremony was held at Xinjiang's Korgas at noon today to mark the restoration of goods deliveries between China and the Soviet Union. Attending today's ceremony were Li Enke, deputy general manager of the China National Foreign Trade Transportation Corporation and a Soviet delegation led by (N.F. Kopchenov), deputy manager of the All-Soviet Economic Accounting Company for Foreign Trade and Transportation.

Deliveries at Korgas of trade goods between China and the Soviet Union have been interrupted for more than a decade.

Through trade talks last year, the two sides agreed to restore goods deliveries between China and USSR at the border stations at Korgas and Torugart.

On the basis of the trade agreement signed by both sides, the two countries agreed to restore goods deliveries first at Korgas and then at Torugart.

At today's ceremony, the representatives of both sides expressed their willingness to expand trade on the bais of equality and mutual benefit. After the ceremony, the Chinese side feted the Soviet delegation.

PRC FRIENDSHIP TOUR GROUP CONTINUES USSR VISIT

Lays Wreaths at Tombs

OW160959 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1300 GMT 15 Nov 83

[Text] The special travel group composed of activists of the Chinese People's association for Friendship With Foreign Countries and the China-USSR Friendship Association, is continuing its visit to the USSR.

On 15 October, the Chinese guests laid wreaths at the Lenin Mausoleum and the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Moscow and visited Lenin's residence and office and the Kremlin Museum. After their (?meeting) with members of the Central Board of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society, the Chinese guests will visit the Moscow University and have a meeting with Soviet writers and translators of (?foreign language) literature at the Soviet Writers Association.

Last Monday the members of the Chinese special travel group had a meeting with Kruglova, chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Union of Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries, and Tikhvinskiy, first deputy chairman of the Central Board of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society. Both sides have expressed the belief that the broadening of contacts between the two countries' friendship associations will help strengthen the friendship between the Soviet and Chinese peoples.

The Chinese guests will visit Leningrad, Tashkent, Baku, and [words indistinct].

Visits University, Writers

OW170551 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to China 1430 GMT 16 Nov 83

[Text] A tour group of activists from the Chinese People's Association for Friendship With Foreign Countries and the China-USSR Friendship Association currently visiting Moscow paid a visit to Moscow University on 15 November. The Chinese guests visited the science center, science organizations, and the university library and also exchanged views with professors of the university. Several members of the tour group once studied at Moscow University. At that time, Moscow University made great contributions to the training of national cadres for the People's Republic of China.

On the same day, the Chinese guests also visited the Soviet Writers' Association and exchanged views with Soviet writers and translators. (Volonov), a Soviet poet and one of the secretaries of the Soviet Writers' Association, welcomed the guests. Among the Chinese guests were noted literary workers, who told their Soviet colleagues about the research work on Soviet and Russian literature being carried out in China.

The Chinese tour group will visit Leningrad on 16 November.

Visits Music Conservatory

OW170108 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to China 1430 GMT 14 Nov 83

[Recorded report on the visit of the tour group of activists of the Chinese Association for Friendship With Foreign Countries and the China-USSR Friendship Society to Moscow Conservatory of Music -- date of visit not given]

[Excerpts] Comrade (Kolikev), president of the Moscow Conservatory of Music, met with the Chinese guests. He introduced the principal professors and lecturers of the conservatory to the Chinese guests. (Lin Zuqiang), president of the Central Conservatory of Music in Beijing, a composer and a graduate of the Moscow Conservatory of Music, delivered a speech after the exchange of warm greetings between Comrade (Kolikev) and Liang Shufen, head of the Chinese tour group, deputy governor of the Hubei Provincial People's Government and council member of the Chinese People's Association for Friendship With Foreign Countries.

[Begin (Lin Zuqiang) recording] Naturally, first of all, on behalf of the tour group, I would like to thank the leadership and the teaching staff of the Moscow Conservatory of Music for their fine hospitality. Although other members of the group do not study music, they love it. They are extremely happy to have the opportunity to visit the Moscow Conservatory of Music. I have told them that the Moscow Conservatory of Music is one of the highest institutions for the study of music in the USSR and that it has trained many talented musicians. Next, I would like to convey greetings to the teaching staff and students of the conservatory from those Chinese musicians who have studied here. They are happy to hear that I am coming here. At the same time, they envy me for the excellent opportunity I have in coming to Moscow. They asked me to send their regards to those at the conservatory here. I would like to mention that they are working hard in our own country and making contributions to composing music with Chinese characteristics.

Naturally we still remember those wonderful days we spent at the Moscow Conservatory of Music, as well as the solitude and assistance given us by the conservatory's teaching staff and students.

Our tour group has the mission to strengthen the friendly ties between the Chinese and Soviet peoples. It is a great honor to be given such an assignment to come to the Soviet Union. Not long ago we met, in Beijing, with a tour group of a similar nature sent out by the USSR Union of Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries and the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society. The Soviet tour group had brought to China the Soviet people's friendship and was given a rousing welcome in China. Without doubt, this kind of mutual visit will definitely strengthen friendship and deepen the understanding between the Chinese and Soviet peoples. In strengthening the friendly relations between the Chinese and Soviet peoples, we, Chinese comrades who have studied in the Soviet Union and those comrades who are doing the work of enhancing Sino-Soviet friendship,should try their best to carry out their work well. Finally, on behalf of the Central Conservatory of Music, I would like to thank the Moscow Conservatory of Music. This is not only because I am the responsible person of the Central Conservatory of Music. More important, many Soviet musicians have worked in the Central Conservatory of Music in the past. [end recording]

Comrade (Kolikev), president of the Moscow Conservatory of Music, delivered a speech in reply. [Begin (Kolikev) recording in Russian, fading into Mandarin translation] After hearing your speech, we are greatly moved. We consider the visit by your tour group a great honor. What makes us even happier is the fact that our graduate is now leading a conservatory of music in Beijing. We are willing to further strengthen the ties between the two conservatories of music, and help the young peoples of our two countries increase their contacts. I believe that music is able to render even greater contributions to the promotion of culture and friendship. [end recording]

After the president of the Moscow Conservatory of Music met with the Chinese guests, they toured various classrooms and the Chinese Music Hall which opened not long ago, where outstanding students of the conservatory were playing music.

Meets With USSR Amity Groups

OW170251 Moscow in Mandarin to China 1600 GMT 15 Nov 83

[Excerpts] Listeners: We have already reported that a special tour group of activists from the Chinese People's Association for Friendship With Foreign Countries and the China-USSR Friendship Association is touring the Soviet Union. On 15 November, a meeting was held between the Chinese tour group and the activists of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society at the House of Friendship With Foreign Countries in Moscow.

During the meeting Academician Tikhvinskiy, first deputy chairman of the Central Board of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society, delivered a speech. On behalf of the Central Board of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society, he welcomed the Chinese tour group and expressed the hope that their visit will be beneficial to both sides. Next, Comrade Kruglova, (?secretary-in-charge) of the Central Board of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society, introduced the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society's activities.

Comrade Kruglova said: The Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society was the first society for friendship with foreign people inaugurated in the Soviet Union.

Since its establishment in 1957, the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society has never suspended its lofty activities. The charter of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society states that the development and strengthening of the friendship with the great Chinese people are the major tasks of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society.

Comrade Kruglova continued: The Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society has regularly held activities to commemorate the most important milestones of the Chinese people's national liberation struggle and revolutionary struggle, as well as Chinese communists, internationalists, and noted literary and art activists. It has regularly commemorated the most important days in the brilliant Soviet-Chinese history.

Comrade Kruglova, (?secretary-in-charge) of the Central Board of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society, concluded: Such a foundation is expanding, and it makes us feel happy. We believe that such a foundation will be conducive to the sublimation of the mutual understanding and friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and China.

Comrade Liang Shufen, leader of the Chinese tour group, vice governor of the Hubei Provincial People's Government, a council member of the Chinese People's Association for Friendship With Foreign Countries, and director of the Hubei branch of the China-USSR Friendship Association, then delivered a speech to the people attending the meeting.

[Begin Liang recording] In our country we also know the activities of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society. (?While here), we have obtained further understanding of the activities. I believe that through activists like us, we will be able to further strengthen the friendship between China and the Soviet Union and the contacts between the two friend ship organizations. On this visit, our tour group is given the task of strengthening the friendship between the peoples of the two countries. We believe that with the help of the Soviet comrades and friends, we will be able to fulfill this mission well. [end recording]

Goes to Leningrad

OW180317 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1000 GMT 17 Nov 83

[Text] A tourist group of activists from the Chinese People's Association for Friendship With Foreign Countries and the China-USSR Friendship Association continued its tour of the Soviet Union. On 16 November, members of the group began a visit to Leningrad, the second biggest city of the Soviet Union.

The Chinese guests visited the cruiser Aurora and the Smolnyy Palace, which was the headquarters for the revolutionary masses in launching an armed uprising in 1917. They also visited the Piskarev Cemetery.

The Chinese guests met with Leningrad Vice Mayor Taukin on the afternoon of (?16) November. Liang Shufen, leader of the Chinese tourist group, said that Leningrad and Shanghai have long been friendly cities. Liang Shufen believed that friendly contacts between Leningrad and Shanghai would continue from generation to generation.

U.S. TRYING 'TO OBSTRUCT' USSR-PRC TIES

OW180654 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to China 1430 GMT 17 Nov 83

[Text] U.S. imperialism has brought untold catastrophes and sufferings to China and the Chinese people in quest of its selfish ends despite the beautiful words and phrases it now uses to cover up its schemes regarding the PRC. It has never had and will never have a sincere desire to give a helping hand to the Chinese people and to help China overcome its economic and other difficulties and realize the return of Taiwan to the motherland. In a nutshell, U.S. imperialism has always been and still is China's fiercest enemy. The U.S. attitude regarding relations between the Soviet Union and China also proves this. In this connection, our station observer Glebov writes:

Soviet-Chinese relations began to deteriorate during the early 1960's not because of mistakes the Soviet Union made. This development gladdened U.S. imperialism because it first of all injured the interests of our two countries and two peoples as well as those of world socialism and the anti-imperialist struggle. Knowing that China weakened its position by suspending its all-round cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the United States lost no time in seizing this golden opportunity to try to realize its imperialist schemes in Asia.

Washington knows quite well that the political, economic and military pressure put on the PRC by the U.S. imperialists during the 1950's produced no results because the Soviet Union rendered powerful support to the young People's Republic. For instance, a treaty of friendship, alliance and mutual assistance was signed between the Soviet Union and China in 1950. The techical and economic ties between our two countries during the 1950's were another example. A noted Amercian economist said that it was unprecedented in history that a country should help another country establish a comprehensive national economic system. He said this in his analysis of Soviet aid to China designed to help the latter set up several hundred key industrial enterprises and other national economic projects.

Washington clearly knew that the expansion of Soviet-Chinese cooperation in various spheres was opening wide vistas for independent China to become a powerful country and that the suspension of such cooperation would pave the way for imperialist monopoly cliques to carry out economic infiltration into China. With this in mind, the U.S. imperialists began to try every possible means to use the unhealthy trend in China's trade and economic relations with other areas in an attempt to turn China's national economy into one dependent on the monopoly capital groups. The U.S. attempt was, of course, incompatible with China's national interests.

The above explains, to a certain extent, why the United States does not want to see the normalization of relations between the Soviet Union and China. Another reason is that the United States has always harbored hegemonistic designs in Asia. These designs, of course, involve China. However, the Soviet Union, China and other socialist countries have been the main forces to resist these U.S. imperialist designs. The imperialists' supporters openly admit that the unity between the Soviet Union and China has made the United States gain nothing and has stopped its aggression in Asia, including its aggressive ambitions on China.

The United States has a mortal fear for any activities aimed at improving relations between our two countries and has resorted to every possible means to obstruct such activities. During his visit to China not long ago, U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger lost no single opportunity to use the myth of a Soviet threat to intimidate the Chinese people and slander the Soviet Union. Other highranking U.S. officials have done the same thing during their China visits. All U.S. propaganda in China has been anti-Soviet propaganda, and the anti-Soviet elements in U.S. spying organizations have been instigators.

It is known to all that the Soviet Union has been unswervingly striving for the normalization of relations between our two countries. The Soviet position is not aimed at the immediate interests but at the long-term and fundamental interests of our two peoples, the people of other socialist countries and all other peoples in their struggle for national liberation and social progress and at opposing the imperialists and their aggressive schemes.

PAPER CITES ALLEGED U.S. ROLE IN RANGOON BOMBING

PM171254 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No. 46 16 Nov 83 p 9

[Unattributed article under the rubric "A Version": "Who Is Behind the Explosion in Rangoon"]

[Text] The U.S. President's visit to Japan and South Korea pursued such clearly militarist aims that some observers in the Far East had weighty reasons to compare this trip with Dulles' "inspection" tour to Seoul on the eve of the U.S. aggression in Korea in 1950.

While in Seoul, R. Reagan deplored the recent explosion in Rangoon and did his best to add fuel to the anticommunist hysteria. Meanwhile reports have started appearing in the foreign press about the U.S. special services' involvement in this act of terrorism. This is what the Indian DAILY writes, for instance:

The bomb explosion in Rangoon -- intended in all likelihood to do away with President Chon Tu-hwan of South Korea, who was visiting Burma, and with the group of ministers close to him -- was organized by the South Korean National Security Planning Agency. This agency is headed by Ro Sin-yong, a former South Korean foreign minister, who has close ties with the Americans.

Around 150 staffers of this agency who arrived on the eve of his visit "to ensure the President's security" are suspected of complicity in the action which took place in the mausoleum of Burma's national hero Aung San in Rangoon.

The attempted political assassination in Rangoon is very reminiscent of the circumstances in which the South Korean dictator Pak Cong-hui died in October 1979. His assassination was prepared and carried out by high-ranking staffers of the South Korean intelligence service who, then as now, maintained close links with the U.S. intelligence services.

Taking the view that Pak Chong-hui's increasing notoriety was extremely unfavorable to themselves, the Americans decided to get rid of that puppet and replace him with "a less odious figure." A new "strong man" was, according to their plan, to stabilize the situation in South Korea and secure that country's continued active participation in the implementation of U.S. plans in the region.

According to some political observers, Chon Tu-hwan had of late tried to conduct an -- up to a point -- "independent policy" and wanted to use anti-American sentiments in South Korea as a means of exerting pressure on Washington with the aim of wresting certain concessions from it. This strategy and course of Chon Tu-hwan's had been received with alarm across the ocean.

Judging by appearances, the South Korean dictator knows that truth about the attempt on his life. But the whole delicacy of his position lies in the fact that he cannot name the criminals who, despite all differences, remain his main patrons.

U.S., JAPAN PLAN 'MILITARY BASE' IN SPACE

LD161103 Moscow TASS in English 0909 GMT 16 Nov 83

[Text] Tokyo November 16 TASS -- At a U.S. request, Japan's government-owned Space Research Corporation has signed an agreement with a consortium of Japan's eight leading

industrial companies and will participate in the development of a huge U.S. orbital complex consisting of a manned module, a separate automatic "platform" and several satellites and "supply ships." The agreement is reported by the newspaper NIHON KEIZAI. According to the press, the Ronald Reagan administration is pinning on that space system its delirious plans to achieve "military superiority in space" and to secure the ability to deliver "a victorious first nuclear strike."

The cost of the development of a "military base" in outer space will amount to an astronomical sum of about 85 billion dollars at the first stage alone. That is why, the news agency KYODO reports, Washington is now trying hard to involve in that programme its partners in militarist alliances and treaties.

The Pentagon is pinning special hopes on the use of Japanese know-how for the production of optical fibre, laser units, super-large integral circuits and other systems in which Japanese companies lead their U.S. rivals. Earlier this year the Nakasone cabinet gave the green light to Japanese businessmen for participation in U.S. military build-up programmes by having allowed them to make available to the Pentagon all the types of war technology.

Tokyo has already agreed in principle to set aside about 600 billion yen for tentative design and development work for the establishment of the "military base" in outer space, NIHON KEIZAI reports.

DRA FOREIGN MINISTER STOPS OVER IN MOSCOW

PM171450 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Nov 83 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "On the Way to New York"]

[Text] Sh.M. Dost, member of the PDPA Central Committee and DRA foreign minister, stopped over in Moscow 13-14 November on his way to New York to take part in the 38th UN General Assembly session.

AFGHAN VETERANS BACK REVOLUTION, NEW SOCIETY

PM171639 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Nov 83 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent G. Ustinov "Afghan Reportage": "A 'Yes' to the Revolution: A Vivid Page in Afghanistan's Most Recent History"]

[Text] Kabul -- The DRA National Fatherland Front's Hall of Sessions has seen many different gatherings, but the present one which opened 16 November is truly unusual.

From all over the country more than 400 state and public figures of the past -- former members of parliament, ministers, and representatives of the old officer corps -- have come here for a 2-day nationwide jirga.

From the first day of the April revolution the reactionary foreign press has been fiercely proclaiming that the democratic changes which are taking place in Afghanistan have allegedly been imposed on the country, are alien to its people, and lack support in Afghan society. And it is precisely these false fabrications of imperialist propaganda which are the main slogan in the undeclared war being waged against the young DRA, the banner under which the forces of external and internal reaction are rallying.

"We have gathered in this hall to express resolute support for the people's government of the republic," Muhammad Hakim Sidiqi prominent public figure and chairman of the DRA National Fatherland Front in Takhar Province said in conversation with me. Every honest and sober-minded person can see that the aim of the revolutionary transformations which are being carried out in our republic is the welfare of the working people who for many years languished in poverty and ignorance. I was a member of parliament for 8 years and I know well what incredible efforts it took in the past to uphold and push through a decision of any significance, to say nothing of legislation, if it was based on the problems and needs of an ordinary village, a peasant community, or a small tribe. Now every action, every step taken by our government aims at meeting the vital interests of the Afghan people."

...One after another the jirga participants mount the rostrum. Not all of them in the revolution's first days and months recognized its correctness and supported it. But the logic and truth of life have convinced these people of the greatness and nobility of the aims the republic has set itself.

Expressing their full solidarity with and support for the national democratic revolution which is taking place in the country, the jirga participants resolutely denounce all forms of imperialist intervention in Afghanistan's affairs inspired by the United States.

At the same time they appraise highly the all-around, fraternal political, economic, and military assistance given to the DRA by the friendly Soviet Union.

In their speeches the public figures of the old and the new Afghanistan are turning to their compatriots who have sided with the counterrevolution under the influence of false and hostile propaganda and are appealing to them to lay down their arms and devote their lives to building a just, happy, and prosperous society.

As Babrak Karmal's message to the meeting's participants stresses, the jirga of well known and respected Afghan figures will indubitably become a vivid page in the country's most recent history, play an effective role in securing peace and complete national harmony on Afghan soil, and be an important contribution to building the new society.

BAKU CITES IRANIAN 'INTERFERENCE' IN DRA AFFAIRS

GF171840 Baku International Service in Azeri 1300 GMT 16 Nov 83

[Unattributed commentary: "Iran Is Increasing Its Interference in DRA Affairs"]

[Text] Dear listeners: A few days ago, HAQIQAT-E ENQELAB-E SAWR, which is printed in Kabul, drew attention once again to facts exposing Iran's interference in the DRA's affairs. The daily wrote that Iranian officials are forcing the Afghans living in that country to engage in military preparations. They then move to use them in disruptive activities against their own homeland. Apart from this, Iranian officials are using every means to prevent them from returning to Afghanistan. It is common knowledge that various Afghan counterrevolutionary organizations are active in Iran.

It is a well-known fact that Iranians are always among the members of the robber bands that infiltrate Afghanistan through the land of Iran. They take part personally in disruptive activities in Afghanistan including the killing of peaceful people and collect information on the redeployment of DRA military units.

It is common knowledge that anti-DRA articles and various instructions for the counter-revolutionaries are circulated in large numbers in Tehran, Mashhad, Qom, and in other Iranian cities. These are later distributed by the robbers sent into the DRA. Meanwhile, Iran's mass media organs systematically spread information distorting the policy pursued by the populist government in the DRA and the nature of the revolutionary changes effected in that country. In short, the realities prove that Iran's interference in the internal affairs of its neighbor is increasing -- a neighbor which has a right to sovereignty.

But what is encouraging the ruling circles in Iran to interfere in the internal affairs of that country's neighbor? The populist government in Afghanistan has recently made it known on several occasions that it is prepared to (?negotiate) and to resolve all bilateral issues through peaceful means. This would not have been only in the interests of Afghanistan alone. It would have served the interests of both countries. Both Iran and Afghanistan have a common enemy, U.S. imperialism, which is eager to reestablish its position in both of them.

The imperialists have tried to fan fratricide between Iran and Iraq.

Now they are trying to create tension in Iran's relations with all its neighboring countries. Meanwhile, there is a prevailing view that the Iranian leadership favors tense relations with Iran's neighbors. The objective behind this is to divert the people's attention from the unresolved social issues in Iran. It is no secret that all the classes in Iranian society, which rose to struggle against the pro-American and lascivious shah's regime in February 1979, still look forward to changes for the better. However, the many promises made after the ousting of the shah's regime for improving the life of the workers (?are difficult to fulfill).

It seems that the ruling circles in Iran hope that everything will be sorted out by itself, as one proverb says. But, let alone [word indistinct], how can one forget the shortage of provisions and the unemployment which involves over 1 million people? How can one forget that the ruling circles are not interested in the question of land reform and in the hopes of the people who expect a just solution of that national issue. And, when allies in the struggle against the shah's regime remind the ruling circles of Iran about all this, persecution is intensified against them. At such times, shameful calumnies are levelled not only against the (?allies) alone but also against neighboring countries. For example, this was the case when the persecution of the members of the Tudeh Party began. It is not a coincidence that LE MONDE, which is published in France, has asked the following question: Don't the punitive measures against the left-wing forces and the cold war against Moscow mean the beginning of the normalization of relations with Washington?

It is our conviction that Iran has not completely forgotten who rushed to its aid when the entire capitalist world declared an economic blockade against that country and when (?a great force) was concentrated close to its waters in preparation for an intervention. Let us recall at this point that it was the Soviet Union which moved to help. The Soviet Union openly opposed U.S. plans for a military intervention in Iran. On the other hand, it helped Iran alleviate the results of the economic blockade.

Let us also recall that the DRA Government has been moving in the forefront in defending the right of the Iranian people to determine their own future without any interference from the outside. Now, however, through its activity and through the policy pursued by imperialist circles, the Iranian leadership shows that it cooperates with the imperialists on the question of the incidents which have been created around Afghanistan. This policy, however, does not tally with Iran's national interests at all. In this regard, we would like to recall a remark by LE FIGARO which is published in France: Using incidents created around Afghanistan as a pretext, the United States persists in its effort to channel developments in Iran into a direction serving its own interests.

PAPER SCORES U.S. REPORT ON SRV WORKERS IN USSR

PM172019 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 17 Nov 83 First Edition p 3

[Valeriy Kadzhaya article: "How Do Young Vietnamese Workers Live in Russia? The State Department's Crocodile Tears"]

[Text] Concern for human rights has become, so to speak, a government hobby in the United States. The present administration is so selflessly involved with this topic that it has even lost rest and sleep. It is now involved with proving that the USSR is allegedly violating the rights no longer just of Soviet citizens but of foreign citizens also. In this connection the U.S. State Department has prepared and presented to Congress a report "On the Question of the Use of Vietnamese Workers in the USSR." And Congress passed this report to a specialized UN institution -- the ILO -- stating that "the U.S. Government is concerned.... by instances of human rights violations, including the possibility that a covert type of forced labor is to a certain extent to be inflicted on certain workers."

The State Department report goes on to note that "there is virtually no doubt that the Vietnamese are people whose status is analogous to the position of people involved in a covert type of forced labor." "A considerable part of their earnings is retained." "Although spokesman for the socialist countries assert that Vietnamese wages are comparable with those of Soviet citizens, their actual earnings after deductions are probably less." "They have to work in the cold, and their benefits are small." "The Vietnamese usually live a solitary life in separate hostels." "A significant number of them are evidently involved in manual labor." And so on in the same vein.

"Take a look at the riders: "virtually no doubt", "probably", "evidently", "it seems", "may, to a certain extent" -- everything is so vague. Naturally, for the facts are taken from the same vague reports in the bourgeois press. But herein lies the very essence of anti-Soviet technique. First, insinuations in the press. Then a government report based on them. The report is sent to the ILO. It does not matter that the ILO cannot take it seriously. The "informed" press then presents this downright lie as an already proven truth: Look, they say, the matter has even reached the United Nations!

The State Department's report only tallies with the truth in one respect: Vietnamese workers in the USSR are indeed working. In April 1981 an intergovernmental agreement was signed between the Soviet Union and the SRV to the effect that Vietnamese citizens would be sent and accepted for professional training and work in USSR enterprises and organizations. In accordance with it, young Vietnamese men and women are currently working in Krasnodar, Ashkhabad, Donetsk, Volgograd, Kemerovo, Barnaul, and Tolyatti -- in 22 krays and oblasts in 4 republics. They master their trades in plants, factories, mines, and construction sites, to return to their motherland as highly qualified workers.

The aforesaid Soviet-Vietnamese agreement regulates in detail all questions linked with the work and life of Vietnamese in the USSR. In everything concerning work protection, wages, social security privileges, and so forth, the Vietnamese workers enjoy all rights on a part with their Soviet counterparts. The first 3 months are set aside for language learning, and then professional training lasts up to a year. During this period they receive not less than R70 per month. Independent work begins after examinations have been passed and a skill rating conferred.

Despite the fact that it is not specially stipulated in the agreement, the Soviet side, it stands to reason, sends the Vietnamese to the best, model enterprises.

SOVETKSAYA ROSSIYA has already written about one of the ones in which they work -- the Krasnodar worsted cloth combine -- in the report entitled "We Are at Home" on 18 May this year. Recently I visited the Khimvolokno production association in Kalinin. Young Vietnamese women are working here. The enterprise has the latest equipment, bright spacious shops, fresh air, and is at room temperature winter and summer. The enterprise has its own House of Culture, a stadium, swimming pool, two sports halls, skiing and boating facilities, and an excellent medical center where 27 doctors handle all types of treatment, for free, naturally, and for the Vietnamese as well.

I also visited the hostel where the Vietnamese girls live together with young Soviet women. In their spare time they paint, go to sports clubs, and celebrate holidays, birthdays, and so forth together. There is no isolation at work either: the guests work in mixed international teams in the leading trades. I emphasize -- the leading ones. And so as not to return to this subject again I shall say that the Vietnamese workers are not involved in manual labor in a single Soviet enterprise. This is also stipulated by the agreement envisaging the training of highly qualified workers.

At the association's trade union committee I was given a document clearly showing that the average earnings of Vietnamese and Soviet working women were virtually identical. And in Krasnodar, for instance, where the young Vietnamese women arrived a year earlier than the Kalinin girls, they had even outstripped their Soviet friends in wages. Deductions? None apart from income tax, and that tax is the same for Vietnamese and Soviet people. Leave? Some 40 young Vietnamese women visited vacation centers this year; the total cost of the trip was R44, but they paid only R13, the rest being made up from social security funds. Some 32 young women vacationed in preventive treatment sanatoria. The total cost of the trip was R50, they paid R16, the rest being made up by the trade union. Incidentally, Vietnamese workers, although members of Vietnamese trade unions, do however enjoy all the privileges granted to Soviet trade union members.

When in the hostel that night I acquainted the young women with the State Department report, they greeted it with laughter. In no way could they believe that this was not the fiction of a latter-day Baron Nunchausen but a government document. Then the girl whose room it was -- 19-year-old (Dang) -- noted seriously: "They just don't want us to be friends. Everything's just like home here. Here I have sisters, there's Momma Valya...."

She was thinking of Valentina Fedorovna Dobrynina, her mentor who had taught her her trade. It has to be said that the Vietnamese call their mentors their mothers and fathers, and not just in Kalinin but in the other places too. This arose almost immediately and independently at the very beginning when they did not yet know the language and found it hard to pronounce a name and patronymic. Later, however, it caught on and became the most real and natural form of address.

"The Americans would do well to read this," (Dang) said and produced the plant newsletter which had printed a letter from Vietnam.

"With all our heart, we, (Dang Khan Kha's) parents, send a big 'hello' and best wishes to your collective, leaders, and teachers. Reading the letters from our daughter who is learning her trade at your enterprise, we are most grateful to you for your great concern for our children. I and my wife work in the city of Haiphong. Many Soviet specialists work in our city. They aid us in building. During the war with the Americans I was seriously wounded."

"Many Vietnamese families suffered at the hands of the U.S. aggressors. Owing to the war our children did not have the opportunity to study.

"In her letters our daughter talks in detail of the Soviet teachers' concern for her and her friends. In her last letter she told us that she had become a socialist competition winner and sent a newspaper with her picture. We are very proud of this and thank you for the great concern shown for our children. We are confident that our daughter and all the young Vietnamese men and women will become good workers. We send you heartfelt greetings and best wishes. Sincerely, (Dang Van Loc)."

It is not only the unpardonable lies in the propaganda ruckus whipped up by the United States that arouse indignation, but the no less unpardonable hypocrisy. For it is no secret to anyone, including the Americans, how deplorable the position of foreign workers is in the United States itself, and also in the FRG, Britain, and France.

And finally, the closing notes of the report have a simply blasphemous ring: "The U.S. Government will continue to do everything possible to attract international public opinion to this question." The international public has too fresh a recollection of the ashes of Song May, "Agent Orange", and the other atrocities committed in Vietnam on the orders of the U.S. Government, which is now so concerned for "human rights" in general and the rights of Vietnamese workers in the USSR in particular!

AUSTRALIAN WOMEN'S ANTINUCLEAR STAND PRAISED

LD171300 Moscow World Service in English 0710 GMT 17 Nov 83

[Igor Bestuzhev commentary]

[Excerpts] For the first time in Australia, a group of women participants in the antiwar movement have pitched a tent peace camp near the country's biggest military base, Pine Gap. Igor Bestuzhev comments:

The women declared that they were inspired by the example of the British women, who were courageously upholding peace in the peace camp near the Greenham Common base. The demands put forward by the Australian peace champions are close to those advanced by the British women. The main demand is to remove American bases from the country.

The hopes which the Australian peace supporters cherished regarding the coming of the Labor government to power have been dispelled. The Labor Party promised at one time to put all the American bases in Australia under a strict control, but it failed to do that. On the contrary, the visit of the prime minister, Robert Hawke, to the United States showed clearly that the Labor government set the [as heard] sights on the promotion of the military alliance with Washington. The prime minister reaffirmed in particular the right of the Pentagon to use its military installations in Australia and send nuclear-carrying ships to her ports.

In other words, as Australian peace champions point out, another step was made to turn Australia into an American nuclear hostage. This is all the more so since Washington's policy is becoming more and more dangerous and unpredictable, as the aggression in Grenada has revealed. The mounting antiwar movement in Australia, the setting up of a peace camp in the vicinity of Pin Gap in particular, is a forceful illustration of the fact that the Australians refused to put their lives at mortal risk just for the sake of safeguarding American interests.

TASS STATEMENT ON TURKISH CYPRIOT UDI

PM171628 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Nov First Edition p 5

["TASS Statement" -- TASS headline]

[Text] On November 15 the leadership of the Turkish community of Cyprus announced formation of the so-called "independent state" in the island's northern part which has been under foreign military occupation for the tenth year now. This is the action which is directly aimed at partitioning Cyprus and which runs counter to repeated decisions of the U.N. General Assembly and the Security Council. There is no doubt that this separatist action undermines the foundations of a fair political settlement that would duly take into account the legitimate interests of both communities on the island, and leads to a dangerous heightening of the situation in Cyprus and in that region as a whole.

It is noteworthy that the above-mentioned events in Cyprus took place in conditions of the over-all heightening of international tension as a result of action of forces, which kindle seats of conflict in different parts of the globe, which seek to sow mistrust and hostility between states and peoples. What has taken place in Cyprus is the direct consequence of such actions.

The profound concern, which is now expressed everywhere over the development of events in Cyprus, is shared in the Soviet Union. The opinion in the leading circles of the Soviet Union is that in the interests of the Cyprus people themselves, in the interests of consolidation of peace and tranquility in the whole region, it is necessary that the Turkish-Cypriot leadership should repeal their decision and resume as soon as possible constructive intercommunal negotiations with the mediation of the U.N. secretary general in accordance with the decisions of the United Nations Organization with a view of attaining durable and fair settlement in the island.

It is also important that all the states should display restraint and that nobody should undertake actions that might further complicate the situation and heighten tension in Cyprus and the adjacent areas. All conditions should be created to see to it that the Cypriots should be able to resolve their internal affairs without any interference or pressure from outside. Following its principled line, the Soviet Union stands for Cyprus to be an independent, sovereign, territorially integral state, free from any foreign military presence, a state carrying out the nonalignment policy.

TIKHONOV RECEIVES GROUP OF FRENCH BUSINESSMEN

LD171612 Moscow TASS in English 1555 GMT 17 Nov 83

[Text] Moscow November 17 TASS -- Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Nikolay Tikhonov received in the Kremlin today a delegation of the National Council of the French Patronate, headed by President of the Council of Yvon Gattaz which had arrived in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

During the conversation Nikolay Tikhonov expressed satisfaction with the development of the Soviet-French commercial and economic ties. He pointed out that a considerable growth of trade and widening of contacts and exchanges in the sphere of industry and science meet the interests of both countries, prove viability and topicality of the course aimed at broad international cooperation, at peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. It was stressed that the Soviet Union in accordance with the principled line of its foreign policy will be striving for the further widening and deepening of mutually advantageous ties with France in various spheres.

In an atmosphere when the aggressive forces are making ever new attempts to aggravate the international tension still further, the constructive actions aimed at the development of the economic, scientific and cultural ties are becoming an important factor of the consolidation of peace.

On their part representatives of the French business circles came out for the widening of fruitful cooperation between France and the Soviet Union.

Some questions connected with the prospects of the development of business ties between Soviet and French organizations and firms in a number of concrete spheres were discussed during the conversation.

Present at the conversation that passed in a business-like friendly atmosphere were representatives of the leadership of a number of industrial firms of France included in the French Patronate as well as French Ambassador in the Soviet Union Claude Arnaud.

[Moscow Television in Russian at 1800 GMT on 17 November, in an otherwise-identical report in its Vremya newscast, supplies the following alternate final paragraph:

["Taking part in the conversation, which took place in a businesslike and friendly atmosphere, were Claude Arnaud, French ambassador in the USSR. Taking part in the conversation on the Soviet side were: Comrade Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Comrade Patolichev, minister of foreign trade; Comrade Pitovranov, chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Chamber of Trade and Industry."]

FRG SOCIAL DEMOCRATS EXPECTED TO REJECT MISSILES

LD180421 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 17 Nov 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Georgiy Zubkov]

[Text] Tomorrow, 18 November, an extraordinary congress of the German Social Democratic Party [SDP], opens in Cologne. It will last 2 days. The congress is to take a very important decision. Its delegates are to determine a final opinion on the deployment of new U.S. nuclear missiles in West Germany. It is truer to say that it will review its former decision. In the winter of 1979 the Social Democrats came out in favor of the deployment in the FRG of Pershings and cruise missiles.

But in the past 4 years the opinions of not only the party's rank-and-file members but the leadership have changed considerably. The majority of observers consider that this time the forthcoming congress will come out against the deployment of U.S. missiles and for the continuation of the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva.

Where does such certainty come from? What has influenced the radical change of mood of the West German Social Democrats? I shall mention the three most important factors. First, on the one hand, there is the appearance of the increasingly aggressive course of the U.S. Administration and, on the other, the peace-loving Soviet initiatives. Western Europe is coming to understand with increasing clarity who has really brought the Geneva talks to an impasse and who is striving to do everything possible to find a way to limit and reduce nuclear armaments in Europe, who is proposing specific and mutually acceptable measures for this. Yes, this is how the USSR is acting.

Of course, the antiwar and antimissile movement played a role in changing the mood of the Social Democrats. Willi Brandt, chairman of the party, has moved away from his former positions.

His speech in Bonn at the end of October at a 500,000-strong antimissile meeting is considered a turning point for the whole party. Hans-Joachim Vogel, chairman of the parliamentary group of the party, considers the deployment of the missiles inappropriate. He states that the new Soviet proposals discussed in Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov's replies to questions from PRAVDA are a good basis for reaching a mutually acceptable understanding in Geneva. Vogel rightly sees as the key to the success of the talks the taking into account of the French and British medium-range nuclear forces.

Of course, there are in the party also some who support the NATO plans and one of these is the party's deputy chairman, Helmut Schmidt. It is expected that at the Cologne congress he will try to put pressure on Social Democrats who are still wavering. But I repeat that the majority of observers still consider that the congress will come out against the deployment of the missiles.

This is supported by what happened at the meeting of the Federal Executive of the SDP. A report about it has just come in today. The Executive discussed the congress's draft resolution rejecting the U.S. and NATO plans. Demands are being made that instead of deploying Pershings and cruise missiles, the Geneva talks on limiting nuclear armaments in Europe should be continued. The resolution which will be put forward for discussion by the congress was adopted by an overwhelming majority, with 27 members of the Executive in favor and only 5 against.

It is important to note that the draft resolution criticizes the U.S. position at the Geneva talks. It is pointed out that the Reagan administration is not taking the Soviet peace proposals and initiatives seriously enough. There is also condemnation of the position of the West German Government of Kohl and Genscher, which in essence comes down to total justification of the bankrupt U.S. line at the talks.

If the Social Democrats at their congress say no to the U.S. nuclear missiles, this will mean that the party that is now the largest opposition party in West Germany will take up the corresponding position in the forthcoming debates on the U.S. missiles in the Bundestag. The debate is intended for 21-22 November.

In Britain protests are intensifying against the deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles that has begun on the territory of the country. We do not want our children to be the last generation on earth -- a demonstration under this slogan took place in the British capital in Trafalgar Square. The majority of participants in the demonstration were women. They wished to walk along the streets of the city but the police dispersed them. Sixty people were arrested. Another seven people were detained by the police during an antiwar demonstration in Whitehall near the monument to the victims of the First and Second World Wars. In the past 3 days alone about 600 people have been arrested while protesting against the deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles.

OBSERVERS PREVIEW FRG BUNDESTAG MISSILE DEBATE

Serov on Debate

LD171515 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0721 GMT 17 Nov 83

[Excerpts] Moscow, 17 Nov (TASS) -- TASS political observer Vladimir Serov writes:

Decisions are to be taken in the days to come in the FRG which will be of extremely important significance for the fate of the country and, what is more, will have an important influence on the further development of the military and political situation in Europe. There will be extraordinary congress of the Social Democratic Party of Germany on 18-19 November in Cologne.

It will make a final decision on the stance of this, the leading opposition party in the FRG, on the nuclear missile decisions of NATO. And afterwards the Bundestag is to adopt a decision on the matter of deployment on the country's territory of new U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles.

In actual fact the implementation of U.S. nuclear missile plans and the transformation of West German territory into a bridgehead for U.S. first-strike missiles aimed at the USSR and its allies would signify a mortal danger for the FRG first and foremost, a comparatively small and densely populated country. To be sure, the verbiage of Washington figures on the "defense" of the Federal Republic in the face of the non-existent "Soviet military threat" is nothing more than a screen for concealing the adventurist aims of Washington, which aspires to wreck the European as well as the global balance of forces and to achieve military superiority over the USSR so that, "brandishing the nuclear big stick" it can dictate all it wants to everyone. From the standpoint of Washington strategists the FRG is nothing more than a "pawn" in their global game in which the stake is the interests of the most aggressive circles of U.S. imperialism.

Even many rank and file members of the Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union and ruling Free Democratic Party are beginning to recognize the danger of turning the population of the country into Washington's nuclear hostages. However, the leadership of these parties, obediently following the lead of Reagan's policy, insists on deploying Pershing II and cruise missiles in the FRG. These weapons are a typical first-strike weapon giving the United States the opportunity of carrying out a swift attack from West German territory. This position is a radical contradiction of the statements of officials in Bonn that war must never start on German soil. The days to come will show whether or not the West German Bundestag will take this principle, which is of vital importance for the country, into consideration in their decisions.

PRAVDA'S Yakhonotov

PM181047 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Nov 83 First Edition p 4

[Own correspondent Yu. Yakhontov dispatch: "The FRG: On the Eve of the Missile Debates"]

[Text] Bonn, Nov 17 -- It is not long now until 22 November -- the day when the deployment of the Pershing II and cruise missiles -- the new U.S. first-strike weapons -- is to begin officially in the FRG. The government was in a hurry to announce this date in advance, even though it was well aware of the prevailing feelings in the country on this score. To be precise: Most of the FRG population, trade unions, entire parties, and numerous organizations, associations, and federations oppose the "arms upgrading." This was convincingly shown by recent events and was shown most vividly of all by the Week of Action for Peace that swept across the entire FRG accompanied by truly massive strikes, huge demonstrations, and the blockading of U.S. military bases and the proposed missile deployment sites.

It is now abundantly clear that the government intends to ignore the opinion of the people's masses. Indeed, that is how the authorities are treating the country's parliament and the deputies' viewpoint when what they have done, even before the discussion of the question in the Bundestag, is to schedule 22 November, the last day of the parliamentary debates, as the day that the FRG begins to be turned into a U.S. nuclear missile bridgehead.

Here, of course, simultaneously is both the complexity and the tragedy of the present situation in the FRG. The majority of the country's population is against the missile deployment. This is an indisputable fact. But the government, relying on a Bundestag majority, supports it. It is an unnatural situation even from the viewpoint of bourgeois democracy. It was clearly with good reason that the conservative FRANKFURTER ALGEMEINE called what is soon to take place in the Bundestag a "Bonn provincial theater show." Who cannot see that prevailing correlation of seats within the parliament on the missile question in no way reflects the correlation of forces outside it!

The Week of Action for Peace was more than just an antiwar and antimissile action by the multimillions-strong masses. It demonstrated once again, as the statement of the German Communist Party Board Presidium noted, that the "Federal Government and the Bundestag have neither the authority nor the mandate to agree to the deployment of the Pershing II and cruise missiles on the FRG's soil. Otherwise they would be acting in defiance of the majority of the population. It feels very uncomfortable in the role of Washington's hostage. Particularly now that events in far-off Grenada have opened many people's eyes to who it is who will essentially decide the question of whether the FRG remains on or disappears from the face of the earth. They have seen with their own eyes how unpredictably dangerous the actions of the White House bosses can be for peace.

The military intervention in Grenada, carried out on the U.S. President's order in defiance of all the norms of international law, has caused deep indignation among the West German population. Virtually all the major newspapers, with the probable exception of Springer's publications, have sharply condemned this act of flagrant aggression. Angry voices were also heard in the Bundestag demanding the withdrawal of foreign troops from the island. Bonn, through its foreign minister, merely issued a mild rebuke to its "elder brother," remarking that had it known of the other's intentions, it would probably have "advised against" such an action.

A few days later a salvo rang out from the heavy guns in the camp of the big industrial and financial bourgeoisie. In an editorial entitled "Bonn's Mistake," their mouthpiece -- FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE -- rebuked those who stand at the helm of power in the FRG for forgetting "solidarity with the United States." "We need America more than we need Britain or France, for example," the newspaper stated, putting the pieces on the West's political chessboard in their places.

And literally the following day the "appropriate conclusions" were drawn. In a speech to the Bundestag on 10 November, the federal chancellor now raised America's criminal aggression against Grenada almost to the level of a mission of liberation bringing allegedly long-awaited "freedom" to the islanders. That is the kind of escapade that is taking place on the Rhine.

Those people who are now trying to get U.S. missiles onto West German soil are trying to stem the tide of hostility and distrust in the FRG toward the United States and NATO. Here the FRG leaders like to cite a "fresh" document -- the statement by the North Atlantic bloc council adopted in Bonn on 10 June 1982. At that time the participants in the NATO meeting proclaimed that "our weapons will never be used except as a response to attack."

The U.S. bandit attack on a sovereign state was a sharp shock primarily for Bonn and for those FRG citizens who still harbored illusions regarding the White House boss. They have grounds for again seriously considering whether it is possible to rely on the U.S. ruling circles in such an unprecedentedly risky business as the deployment on FRG soil of nuclear missiles aimed at neighbors who not so long ago were victims of the bloody Hitlerite aggression.

And whether it is possible to trust people to whom there is nothing sacred, as the adventure with Grenada shows, for whom a lie is more valuable than truth, and for whom there exists neither international law, nor commitments, nor ultimately any understanding of the fact that many millions of lives depend on their mode of action.

FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU wrote recently: "The question arises: How predictable are the U.S. Administration's actions in the foreign policy sphere? What moves may the Reagan administration decide on in the future...?" "The U.S. Administration," the newspaper went on, "is pushing NATO toward a serious crisis. Predictability and reliability -- these are the two elements missing from the policy of the most important member of the West European alliance. The Europeans and Canada must call a clear 'halt!' to this course of Washington's. Otherwise they will relegate themselves to the role of vassals. "Vassals" is precisely what it says. On the main issues and, in particular, on the missile question the present FRG Government is following in Washington's "footsteps," obediently repeating all its orders and all the insane fabrications of the Washington rulers. Trying in every way to justify and to "validate" the deployment of the new U.S. missiles, FRG Chancellor H. Kohl has gone so far as to try to present the threat to unleash nuclear war as a means of keeping the peace! He stated literally the following during a speech at a Christian Democratic Union Conference in Bonn: "The most reliable guarantee of this is nuclear deterrence."

When you read the press here, watch television, or talk with ordinary people unburdened by political responsibility and occupied with their own everyday affairs, you can see that the aggression against Grenada has caused confusion and a change of mind among many people. The aggression has seriously shaken the idea, dinned in over the decades, of the "reliability" of their senior transatlantic partner, whose Pershing II and cruise missiles, it is claimed, may be their only reliable shield against the "threat from the East."

The fact is that the supporters of "arms upgrading" now need the belief in the "threat from the East" engendered by the efforts of bourgeois propaganda and insinuated into the consciousness of many West German citizens as much as they need air. Without it the foundation on which the U.S. missile launchpads are to rest will not exist. Without it the oral "justification" for the inhuman thesis of the permissibility of the NATO countries' use of nuclear weapons, a thesis propounded in the FRG Defense Ministry's White Paper, will also collapse. And all the Washington and NATO military "concepts" in Europe will be turned completely upside down.

Things are difficult in the FRG for people who are politically inexperienced. For the most part they are allowed to acquaint themselves with the other side's arguments. For example, the full text of such an important document as Yu. V. Andropov's replies to PRAVDA's questions is still being kept from them. Instead they are palmed off with a prepared "account" of the supposed essence of the new USSR initiatives along with commentaries in which these initiatives are discredited and utterly rejected. Only a very few publications in the country convey to their readers the Soviet Union's voice undistorted by fabrications. And correspondingly few people are aware that the Soviet Union has again proposed, for the umpteenth time, a compromise that is rational and fair from all viewpoints and, given answering goodwill from the United States and NATO as a whole, would make it possible to quickly reach agreement at Geneva and to free the European Continent from another and extremely dangerous round in the arms race.

"Is it sensible to turn down the latest Soviet proposals?" FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU asks. E. Bahr, chairman of the Bundestag Disarmament and Arms Control Subcommittee and a prominent figure in the Social Democratic Party of Germany, believes that the West should explore these proposals and discuss them before beginning the "arms ugrading." Many other well qualified people familiar with the essence of the USSR's initiatives also support that opinion.

But Bonn (and, of course, Washington) is deaf to the voice of reason. Having taken the decision to begin the missile deployment on 22 November -- and not a day later! -- a date, furthermore, of their own choosing, the product of their own ill will, they find that it hangs around their necks like a dead weight.

It is understandable that in the light of what has been said the reactions in the FRG to the new Soviet proposals have been varied. The government has acknowledged that they contain "certain positive features" as well as "negative" and thus "unacceptable" features too.

People familiar with the latest Soviet initiatives are concerned by the realization that if the United States continues not to shift from its fixed position on this question the appearance of the new U.S. missiles in Western Europe will provoke a new round in the arms race. The question now is whether Western figures have enough caution and realism to act as the true interests of the West European peoples and the interests of all-European peace demand. In this respect the need is not for new hypocritical maneuvers to deceive the public such as Washington has recently undertaken again, but for genuine political farsightedness and real responsibility for the fate of peace. And on this level the FRG is being given a golden and, who knows, perhaps final opportunity to prevent the deployment of the U.S. missiles and consequently to halt the dangerous development in Europe and to promote the continuation of talks and a return to detente.

FRG DELEGATION CONTINUES ECONOMIC TALKS

Delegation Visits Azerbaijan

GF151954 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 14 Nov 83

[Text] An FRG delegation visiting the Soviet Union in connection with the 12th meeting of the joint USSR-FRG Committee for Economic, Scientific, and Technological Cooperation has arrived in Baku. The FRG delegation is headed by Minister of Economics Otto Graf Lambsdorff. Among the members of the delegation are Kastl, the FRG ambassador to the Soviet Union; and (Tomzehn), member of the administrative committee of [name indistinct] firm. Leonid Konstandov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Presidium; (Molitov), trade representative of the Soviet Union in the FRG; and [name indistinct], deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, are accompanying the delegation on its visit to the various parts of the Soviet Union.

Welcoming the guests at Baku airport were Gasan Seidov, chairman of the Presidium of the Azerbaijan Council of Ministers; Suleyman Tatliyev, first deputy chairman of the Presidium of the Azerbaijan Council of Ministers, and Ayaz Mutalibov, deputy chairman of the Presidium of the Azerbaijan Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Planning Committee of Azerbaijan.

The members of the delegation have visited a number of industrial establishments in Baku. At the oil and gas extraction administration named after (Mabrask), Abbasov, director of the Caspian Oil and Gas Industry Union, briefed them on the conditions of extracting oil from the sea and on the supply of new technological equipment to the mines. The guests also visited the new oil-refining factory in Baku named after Vladimir Lenin and became acquainted with the (Katalektik) [word indistinct] complex. Minister of Petroleum-Refining and Petrochemical Industry Namik Aliyev briefed the guests on the history, the present situation, and the future of Azerbaijan's oil industry, and on the work carried out to protect the environment.

At the Baku champagne factory, Yunis Rzayev, chairman of the State Committee for Viticulture and Winemaking, acquainted the members of the delegation with the development perspectives in the field concerned. The guests also visited the popular arts museum and viewed Baku's landscape from the park named after Kirov.

Gasan Seidov, chairman of the Presidium of the Azerbaijan Council of Ministers; Suleyman Tatliyev, first deputy chairman of the Presidium of the Azerbaijan Council of Ministers; and Ayaz Mutalibov, deputy chairman of the Presidium of the Azerbaijan Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Planning Committee of Azerbaijan, accompanied the guests on their tour of Baku.

A reception was given in the evening by the Azerbaijan Council of Ministers in honor of the visiting delegation. The guests have departed for Tbilisi.

Through an initiative by the correspondent of AZERINFORM, Minister of Economics Otto Graf Lambsdorff expressed his views about Baku. He said: Our delegation has become well acquainted with Baku, which has a lot of [word indistinct] and (?attractions). We have visited [word indistinct], and the refinery -- all of which have been well built. Automation is at a high level in these installations. Complex measures have been put into effect for the protection of the environment. We also became acquainted with the champagne factory. And, I intend to discuss with my Soviet colleagues the question of having these wines sent to the FRG.

Lambsdorff on Talks

DW171112 Mainz ZDF Television Network in German 2020 GMT 15 Nov 83

[Interview with Economics Minister Otto Graf Lambsdorff by Dieter Balkhausen in Moscow: "Business Despite Missiles" -- live from Moscow TV Studio 3]

[Excerpts] [Balkhausen] The first question goes to you, Mr Lambsdorff. You had a talk of an hour and a half today with Soviet Premier Tikhonov. Did you gain the impression that the Soviet Union is receptive to compromise on the missile issue?

[Lambsdorff] No, I can't say that. Nor was this the main topic of the discussion. The main topic involved questions concerning economic and trade policies. The missile issue was brought up by Premier Tikhonov only in the very last part of our meeting. It would be too far-fetched to conclude from this that there is readiness to compromise in Geneva. I can only answer this question in the negative.

[Balkhausen] Were your negotiations and talks burdened by any political tensions? After all, before you undertook the trip here you couldn't but look forward to these talks with suspense because of the missile issue.

[Lambsdorff] We did so, of course. We were aware indeed of the political background against which the commission would be meeting this time. Yet, I must say that all Soviet contacts proved to be extremely helpful and manifested an extreme interest in continuing the trade and economic relations. Perhaps it would be appropriate to add at this point that I talked with the Soviet premier for 75 minutes today on the improvement of economic relations, and he then devoted 15 minutes to the missile issue as the last topic, these 15 minutes including my reply as well.

I don't want to engage in any stopwatch policy, but I do want to say that this goes to show what the main subject of discussion was today. From this we can derive that the Soviet Union definitely is vitally and strongly interested -- just as we are -- in continuing the economic relations in politically difficult times as well.

[Balkhausen] To continue them and even to improve them?

[Lambsdorff] Yes, they expressly draw attention to expansion, enhancement, new fields of activity. If I may put it that way: They put on a bit more pressure and talk about time concepts which so far have been unusual, rather short periods, and they promise to remove bureaucratic impediments.

The Soviet Union decided yesterday, for example, that all representatives of German companies in Moscow will receive a so-called multiple visa, meaning that they will be allowed to travel back and forth several times with an annual visa without being compelled any longer to undergo the sluggish procedure of obtaining new entry or exit permits. Quite obviously this is a concession; it is fulfillment at this particular time of a demand that had been raised some time ago.

Lambsdorff on Missile Issue

DW171113 Hamburg ARD Television Network in German 2130 GMT 15 Nov 83

[Lutz Lehmann report in the "Tagesthemen" program]

[Excerpt] No doubt, harmony dominated at the meeting of Baku and Tiflis, and it is definite that economic cooperation between the Federal Republic and the Soviet Union is to continue even though the minister president of the Georgian Republic during the state banquet stated that it would be insincere to hush up the fact that we [the Soviets] are sad about the deployment of the U.S. missiles.

[Begin Lambsdorff recording] I cannot but reply, Mr Minister President, that I on my part wouldn't be sincere were I neglecting to state that we in the Federal Republic are more concerned about Soviet missiles which already are deployed and targeted on us than about American missiles which haven't even arrived. [end recording]

Meeting With Baybakov

LD161514 Moscow TASS in English 1453 GMT 16 Nov 83

[Text] Moscow November 16 TASS -- A meeting took place here today between Nikolay Baybakov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, and Otto Lambsdorff, economics minister of the FRG.

During their conversation, which passed in an atmosphere of mutual understanding, they discussed the state and prospects of development of economic relations between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany.

Hansjoerg Kastl, the FRG's ambassador to the USSR, Otto Wolff von Amerongen, chairman of the eastern committee of the economy of the FRG, and Berthold Beitz, chairman of the supervisory council of "Fried. Krupp GMBH", also took part in the conversation.

Foreign Trade Discussed

LD161750 Moscow TASS in English 1713 GMT 16 Nov 83

[Text] Moscow November 16 TASS -- FRG Minister of Economics Otto Lambsdorff staying in the Soviet capital was received today by USSR Minister of Foreign Trade Nikolay Patolichev. During the conversation they discussed matters related to the state of commercial and economic ties between the two countries and the possibilities of further development of these ties.

Lambsdorff, Kostandov on Talks

LD161318 Hamburg DPA in German 1224 GMT 16 Nov 83

[Excerpts] Moscow, 16 Nov (DPA) -- "Total success" was how Federal Economics Minister Otto Graf Lambsdorff assessed the 6-day meeting of the German-Soviet Economic Commission which ended in Moscow today. In spite of difficult political conditions, the will of both countries for further cooperation has become clear, Lambsdorff said at the signing of the joint final protocol. USSR Deputy Premier Leonid Kostandov also described the results of this 12th session of the commission as "positive".

The intention of both sides to expand economic cooperation is "completely serious", Kostandov said. Economic relations with the FRG rest on the solid basis of treaties, and considerable experience has been gained. Nevertheless, the "dangerous plans" of the United States to station new missiles in Europe throws a shadow on relations. They also increase the responsibility of business circles which are able to influence politics. Kostandov was asked by journalists: When, after the arrival of the first cruise missiles in Great Britain, will the Soviet Union break off the Geneva negotiations? Kostandov said: "The negotiations will end when our government considers it necessary."

In contrast, Lambsdorff said the influence of business circles will change nothing in the FRG regarding the majority decision on stationing new U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe. Also, he said he doubts whether there are such circles which want to exert such an influence.

On the results of the conference, Lambsdorff said major projects will in future play a relatively minor role. The question of the inclusion of medium and small enterprises played a significant role at the talks. Direct links with Soviet business partners will have to be made possible for these businesses, and bureaucratic obstacles will have to be dismantled as far as possible. The joint communique says in this respect that both sides intend to improve "comprehensive participation" by smaller and medium-sized enterprises.

The next ordinary meeting of the commission is planned for autumn next year in the FRG.

TASS Cites Kostandov

LD161425 Moscow TASS in English 1408 GMT 16 Nov 83

[Text] Moscow November 16 TASS -- The Soviet-West German Commission for Economic, Scientific and Technological Cooperation ended its 12th session here today. It was chaired by Leonid Kostandov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. The West German delegation was led by Otto Lambsdorff, federal economics minister of the FRG.

"We positively assess the results of this session which passed in a businesslike and constructive atmosphere," said Leonid Kostandov. "A number of concrete projects of bilateral cooperation were discussed, in whose realization both major and medium-size and small firms of the FRG could take part jointly with Soviet organizations. The commission reaffirmed that the signed bilateral economic agreements and accords are on the whole being fulfilled successfully."

The large-tonnage production of methanol from natural gas, the production of synthetic liquid fuel from coal mined at the Kanch-Achinsk field, prospecting for and the production of oil and natural gas on the shelf of the Barents Sea, the reconstruction and modernization of a number of wallboard factories, and other economic undertakings were listed among the possible projects of cooperation.

"We hope," Leonid Kostandov said, "That the just-ended session will give an additional impetus to the development of economic links between the two countries, including that in new spheres."

"But I would be insincere," he added, "if I failed to say that the prospects of constructive and mutually beneficial relations between states have of late been darkened by the dangerous plans of deploying new American medium-range nuclear weapons in a number of West European countries, including the territory of the FRG."

"In the seriously aggravated international situation today," the deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers said, "the Soviet leadership is doing everything possible to preserve and enhance peace and prevent another, most dangerous round of the nuclear arms race in Europe. In this situation the responsibility of business circles, which, as is known, have exerted and can exert no small influence on the shaping of the policies of their governments, is also growing."

Lambsdorff Interviewed

LD162041 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 16 Nov 83

[From the Vremya newscast -- Lambsdorff remarks in German with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] The 12th session of the USSR-FRG commission on economic, scientific and technical cooperation ended in Moscow today.

[Begin videorecording] [Correspondent Kondryatev] The FRG is our major business partner among the capitalist states. Last year trade turnover between both countries amounted to R6.6 billion and it, as was noted at the session, has a tendency to grow.

The participants in the session analyzed how bilateral agreements and accords are being fulfilled and discussed plans for the future.

The protocol that was signed on the results of the session provides for stepping up cooperation in machine-building, power engineering, chemistry, agriculture, and in the production of consumer goods.

[Lambsdorff] Cooperation with the Soviet Union is necessary for us. It helps in particular to solve the problem of employment. But the main thing is that our economic relations are conducive to the establishment of mutual understanding between the peoples of both countries and are an important factor in the preservation of peace in Europe and throughout the world.

[Kondryatev] From 1984 onwards deliveries of Soviet natural gas to the Federal Republic will start. What is your opinion of this long-term agreement?

[Lambsdorff] I am not surprised that the Soviet Union has built the pipeline ahead of schedule. I frequently told the Americans that their attempts to hamper the implementation of this project would lead nowhere. This is exactly what happened. I am very satisfied that from next year on we will receive gas from your country. [end recording]

The present session has shown, the minister said in conclusion, that the prospects for our cooperation in the trade and economic sphere are favorable. Our relations are developing dynamically on a stable and mutually advantageous basis. That is how it was in the past and I hope that it will remain like that.

IZVESTIYA Sums Up Session

PM171350 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Nov 83 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In the Interests of Cooperation"]

[Text] The 12th session of the USSR-FRG Commission for Economic, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation, chaired by L.A. Kostandov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, was held in Moscow 11-16 November.

The FRG delegation was headed by Federal Economic Minister O. Lambsdorff.

The commission noted that existing economic agreements and accords are on the whole being successfully implemented and that the economic relations between the two countries have developed further in the period that followed the 11th session. This accords with the desire expressed by both governments during the summit in Moscow in July 1983 to consistently develop trade and economic relations in keeping with mutual interests. The commission deems it important for bilateral economic ties that the terms of the agreement on the development of economic, industrial, and technical cooperation of 19 May 1973 and the agreement on the further development of economic cooperation of 30 October 1974 have been extended by 10 years.

The session examined progress in the implementation of long-term and large-scale projects and emphasized that they represent an important factor in the development of economic ties. The commodity turnover between the two countries is stable and is tending to increase. In 1982 it reached R6.6 billion. The commission noted that cooperation in the sphere of the power industry continues to develop. The sphere of the modernization and reconstruction of a number of industrial enterprises in the Soviet Union continues to afford good prospects. The level of business ties attained at present in agriculture, forestry, the fish industry, and the food industry and related areas enables us to take the next step in their development and to expand cooperation to other sectors of the agro-industrial complex.

The sides agreed to expand contacts in certain spheres of machine building and the power and chemical industry. The state of and prospects for the development of scientific and technical ties were discussed.

The session took place in a businesslike and constructive atmosphere.

Agreement was reached to hold the commission's next session in the fall of 1984 in the FRG.

At a press conference L.A. Kostandov and O. Lambsdorff gave a positive appraisal of the session's results and expressed both sides' desire for further cooperation.

Comparison on Tikhonov Reception

The item entitled "Tikhonov Receives Lambsdorff," published on page G 3 of the 16 November Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, has been compared with a TASS report, "Talk in the Kremlin," carried in Moscow PRAVDA Russian 16 November First Edition on page 1, revealing the following variation:

Page G 4, PRAVDA's last paragraph reads: "Taking part in the talk, which took place in a businesslike atmosphere, were: on the Soviet side L.A. Kostandov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and A.P. Bondarenko, member of the USSR Foreign Ministry Collegium; and on the FRG side H. Kastl, FRG ambassador to the USSR; O. Wolff von Amerongen, chairman of the FRG Eastern Economic Committee; and B. Beitz, chairman of the Fried. Krupp GMBH Supervisory Council. "(supplying alternate passage)

USSR BORDER GUARDS DELEGATION VISITS FINLAND

PM171655 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Nov 83 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "On Official Visit"]

[Text] On 16 November a delegation of Soviet border guards headed by Army General V.A. Matrosov, chief of the USSR KGB Border Guard Troops, arrived in Helsinki on an official visit at the invitation of Lieutenant General (Erkki) Ilmari Kirjavainen, chief of the Finnish Ministry of Interior Border Guards.

HERNU 'PERSONALLY SUPERVISED' BA'LABAKK RAID

LD180616 Moscow TASS in English 1942 GMT 17 Nov 83

[Text] Paris November 17 TASS -- Charles Hernu, France's national defence minister, personally supervised the entire operation in which French combat planes strafed the positions of the Lebanese national-patriotic forces near the city of Ba'labakk. Together with General Jeannou Lacaze, chief-of-staff of the French Armed Forces, the defense minister stayed in the command post at the ministry's premises in Paris. The minister was constantly in touch with the commanding officer of the French contingent of the so-called "Multinational Force" in Lebanon and with the commander of the French naval armada stationed off the Lebanese coast. This fact has been reported by AFP, quoting an "authoritative source."

The National Defense Ministry refused to divulge any details of the air raid on the Ba'labakk area performed by planes based on the aircraft-carrier Clemenceau.

ATTACK ON SYRIA: WESTERN PRESS 'PREDICTING WHEN'

PM171520 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Nov 83 First Edition p 5

[P. Demchenko "International Notes": "Sights on Syria"]

[Text] There has been a definite change of emphasis recently in Western, and especially U.S., press writings on the Near East situation. From debating the question of whether or not there will be an attack on Syria, the journalists have now turned to predicting when it will happen.

One gets the impression that the matter has been settled: There will be an attack. "According to pessimistic forecasts," Paris LE MATIN, for instance, writes, "war with Syria is inevitable." And it goes on to say: "Washington is urging Israel to attack Damascus."

Let us recall that throughout last spring and summer the Israeli command was strengthening its forces in Lebanon's Al-Biqa' Valley and preparing to attack the Syrian troops deployed north of them and along the Beirut-Damascus highway. The Syrians did not flinch then, but stood their ground, operating side by side with Palestinian detachments, and managed to foil the aggression. And now reports have appeared that the striking fist in the region has again been strengthened: Israeli units have taken up combat positions. The raids carried out recently against the Syrians have shown that Tel Aviv is again ready to act.

However, most forecasts give grounds for drawing up a different scheme of the possible development of events. Above all, we are taking about the direct participation of U.S. Armed Forces in the planned operation. The recent hint from R. McFarlane, the U.S. President's new national security adviser, that the Near East may see a repetition of the events in Grenada, only confirms this scenario.

It is well known that 30 U.S. ships with almost 300 warplanes and several tens of thousands of servicemen on board are already on combat alert off Lebanon's shores. This, NEWSWEEK magazine admits, sharply increases U.S. options for air strikes against ground targets and shelling with shipboard artillery.

The alarming and alerting occurrence of recent days is that U.S. carrier aircraft have been carrying out regular reconnaissance flights over Syrian positions. Initially Washington explained all this military activity as a reaction to the blowing up of the U.S. Marine headquarters in the Lebanese capital. "Government circles expect," ABC television reported, "that, if the United States takes any steps in response to the death of 239 of its soldiers in Beirut, it will be a strike against Syrian positions in Lebanon. The Reagan administration thinks that it is Syria which must be the target for a retaliatory strike."

U.S. propaganda has recently been presented with another "argument." Its source was anonymous representatives of intelligence circles. Syria, they assert, "has deployed several SAM batteries in the Al-Biqa' Valley and to the north of the Beirut-Damascus highway. Their position is ideal for shooting at U.S. planes carrying out reconnaissance flights in this region."

So this, it turns out, is the issue: The Pentagon wants its planes to fly unhindered wherever they please. The tragic events in Grenada and also here in the Near East show that Washington is now dispatching its armed forces wherever the situation fails to develop according to the American scenario. Through force, terror, and lawlessness it is striving to subordinate whole countries and peoples to its will. This is not only an adventurist and reckless policy but one that, in the present tense international situation, is fraught with extremely serious consequences.

Nonetheless, Washington is continuing to follow the same dangerous path. As NBC television has just reported, "Intensive negotiations are currently underway with Israel on possible military steps against Syria, which could even include destruction of missiles."

Even these fragmentary reports give grounds for thinking that preparations for the operation have actually been put on a practical basis. Military men confer, the Israeli Cabinet holds a secret emergency session with the participation of the generals, tank tracks clank in the Al-Biqa' Valley, and U.S. reconnaissance planes spy out targets for missiles and shells. At the same time, in order, as it were, to create the appropriate ideological backdrop, THE NEW YORK TIMES declares Syria the "root of evil" in the Near East and says: "The U.S.-Israeli alliance has never been so necessary to both countries as it is now."

In this situation journalists are also guessing (and this is part of the psychological attack) just when the primed military machine will get the order to burst into action. Some say that it will be indicated by U.S. diplomat Rumsfeld's current trip to the Near East. If no results come of his mission, in other words, if he fails to force the Syrians to accept U.S. demands, then there will be no alternative but to hand things over to the generals. Others think that the plan for the operation against Syria and the Lebanese progressive forces which are unwilling to capitulate to the United States, Israel, or local reaction will be agreed upon during the transatlantic trip scheduled for the end of this month by the Israeli head of government and defense minister.

However, all this guesswork does not change the crux of the matter. Washington and Tel Aviv are clearly undertaking a new military adventure in the Near East. They count on deriving the maximum advantage from the present situation in the region, which is complex enough as it is, with the senseless Iran-Iraq war continuing, inter-Arab discord exacerbated, and the PLO's internal differences having led to bloody clashes between rival groupings.

These events are not simply regrettable but also extremely damaging, given the present alarming situation. Cooperation among all anti-imperialist forces is especially necessary now in order to ward off the aggressive raid that is being prepared. The dangerous development of events and the U.S.-Israeli threats must be countered with a coordinated line from the Arab states and the Arab national-patriotic forces.

U.S.-ISRAELI 'DANGEROUS GAME' IN MIDEAST

Air Raid on Lebanon

LD171844 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1530 GMT 17 Nov 83

[Vladimir Bilyakov commentary from the "Window on the Arab World" program]

[Text] The Israeli air raid yesterday against the suburbs of the Lebanese city of Ba'labakk near the Syrian borders has alerted many observers. If we look at the raid within the general framework of the current situation in the Middle East, we would have to infer that this air raid is a part of a large and dangerous game, played by the U.S. and Israel in recent days.

Washington and Tel Aviv have repeatedly threatened the Lebanese and Syrian patriotic forces. The Western newspapers have written dozens of times about the preparations for an American-Israeli armed operation against them. The aim of this operation is completely clear: Since the Lebanese patriotic forces and Syria have not submitted to American political pressure, then this pressure must be complemented with military pressure. Then, according to the reasoning of Washington and Tel Aviv, they would be more responsive to the American-Israeli demands concerning the settlement in Lebanon and the Middle East in general.

It should be noticed that the new Israeli aggression in Lebanon has occurred at a time in which Rumsfeld, the new American envoy, arrived in the region. This has become a bad omen. The arrival of his two predecessors, Habib and McFarlane, in the region was always accompanied by an increase in Israeli aggression. So, Rumsfeld's tour, coupled with the Israeli air raid against Ba'labakk, might become an introduction for a new American-Israeli attack against the positions of the Arab liberation movement.

Exhibiting Military Strength

LD170012 Moscow World Service in English 2100 GMT 16 Nov 83

[Text] Israeli planes have bombed a Palestinian refugee camp in the Al-Biqa' Valley, Lebanon. Commentary by Viktor Olin:

The Israeli military action, judging from the statement of its army representative, is a reprisal for the blowing up of the Israeli barracks in the Lebanese town of Tyre on 4 November. This bombing has introduced a new element of tension into the already explosive situation in Lebanon and the Middle East as a whole. This Israeli action takes on an especially sinister nature against the background of large-scale military preparations and threats by Tel Aviv against Syria. Israel has repeatedly resorted to demonstrations of military strength as a means to intimidate and to provoke conflicts with the Arab countries.

But while Tel Aviv formerly acted by itself, today the United States has directly joined its aggressive course in the Middle East. American Marines and artillery are firing on Lebanese towns and villages. Having concentrated off the Lebanese shore a huge armada of ships and hundreds of war planes, Washington is now threatening to cash in on the so-called American know-how in Grenada against Syria. Gone is the time when Washington hypocritically condemned this or that aggressive act by Israel. Today the allies are united not only by their common goals but also by their common methods. The policy of brutal force has become the basis for the American and Israeli aggressive alliance in the Middle East. Washington-Tel Aviv relations have never been so close, observers note.

This is exactly seen in the current American aid program for Israel, which will receive in 1984 a record sum of $2.6 billion and most of the money will be spent on military objectives. The details of their cooperation in this field is at present being discussed with Israeli President Herzog, who currently visits Washington. Soon the Tel Aviv Prime Minister Shamir and Defense Minister Arens will also be in Washington. Peace and a settlement of most acute problems are not at all the objectives for which the participants and allies strive. Quite to the contrary. These partners are trying to interfere in the internal affairs of any country, if that country does not pursue a policy to the liking of Washington and Tel Aviv.

According to their plan, the Middle East should become a permanent strongpoint for the (?conduct) of punitive operations by the Israeli army or by the American Rapid Deployment Forces, wherever their so-called vital interests are supposedly threatened. All expressions of dissatisfaction or opposition should be punished by the use of a broad arsenal of means, from the use of teargas and water cannons to bombings and invasions. There are plenty of examples to illustrate this. They include the threats against Syria, the reprisals leveled against the Arab population in the occupied Arab lands by Israeli forces and the shelling and bombing of Beirut.

'Anti-Arab Alliance'

LD171315 Moscow TASS in English 1217 GMT 17 Nov 83

["In One Team" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow November 17 TASS -- TASS commentator Grigoriy Vasilyev writes:

The Israeli military have staged another bandit action in Lebanon. As a result of the barbarous bombing of a number of populated localities in the area of Ba'labakk by Israeli Air Force, 35 Lebanese civilians were killed and more than 80 were injured.

As has been repeatedly the case earlier, in particular, in September 1982 when the massacre in the Palestinian camps of Sabra and Shatilla became known, Washington hurried officially to dissociate itself from the Zionists' another vile crime. The influential THE WASHINGTON POST writes that U.S. officials have denied that the Reagan administration knew in advance about Israel's action or that it acted on behalf of the United States. However, the real development of the situation convincingly shows the real value of hypocritical "denials" by the United States which not only encourages the Zionist aggressors but also directly participates in their bloody crimes.

Political observers point out that Israel's each big punitive action is staged either at the moment of a visit to Tel Aviv by a high-ranking U.S. emissary or immediately after the visit. The latest rally should likewise be viewed in direct connection with the recently concluded visit to Israel by Lawrence Eagleburger, U.S. undersecretary of state for political affairs. Noteworthy is also the fact that, directly before the Israeli bombardment, U.S. combat aircraft based on ships near the Lebanese coast made a series of reconnaissance flights over the area of Ba'labakk as well as over the positions of the Syrian contingent of the inter-Arab peacekeeping force in Lebanon.

Niether can Washington's verbal jugglery conceal the fact that the hands of the U.S. Marines, who are the same invaders on Lebanese soil as the Israeli soldiers, are stained with the blood of tens of Lebanese civilians. The artillery bombardments of Lebanese villages near the capital of U.S. heavy naval artillery were no less barbarous than Israeli ones.

Acting in the same team with Tel Aviv within the framework of the notorious anti-Arab military and political alliance, the USA together with the Zionist war criminals share the entire responsibility for reckless ventures that bring blood and suffering to the peoples of the Arab East and create a real threat to international peace and security.

U.S. WILL SUPPLY ISREAL WITH PERSHINGS

PM151119 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 Nov 83 p 1

["Our Commentary" by A. Zhukov: "Like Their Master"]

[Text] Is there anything that is not in Tel Aviv's arsenals? The latest tanks and recoilless guns, supermodern ships and planes, and radar equipment that even Pentagon generals can only envy! And yet there are no Pershing II's. Britain will have them [as published], the FRG will have them. Even little Belgium will have them [as published]. Yet so far Israel has none. And is not expecting any?

Stop. Here is the mistake. There are no Pershings now but they are expected -- and maybe quite soon. After kicking up a propaganda ruckus about Syria's steps to strengthen its defense capability in the face of the danger of a U.S.-Israeli invasion, Tel Aviv, following the example of its transatlantic patron, has begun harping on the old theme that it is, or so it says, weak and defenseless. That is why, THE NEW YORK TIMES reported recently, the new head of the Israeli Cabinet Shamir and Defense Minister Arens intend to "demand from President Reagan deliveries of Pershing II missiles to Israel at the earliest possible itme."

How did Washington react to Tel Aviv's militarist lament? With the usual vocal anti-Syrian campaign, this time instigated by U.S. propaganda, with the intention to satisfy the Zionist warriors' "modest" request. For under the "Memorandum on Mutual Understanding in the Sphere of Strategic Cooperation" signed by the United States and Israel in the fall of 1981, Tel Aviv is declared to be Washington's main strategic partner and ally in the region. The question automatically arises: In the event of their being deployed, against whom will the U.S.-Israeli Pershings be aimed when, from positions on the mountainous East Mediterranean seaboard, where Israel is located, they can reach the southern oblasts of the Ukraine?

"It is quite obvious," Syrian radio points out in its commentary "that Washington is exploiting Tel Aviv's militarist aspirations purely as a cover for its own military plans aimed not only against the Arab national liberation movement, but also against the socialist countries and primarily the Soviet Union."

CASTRO DENOUNCES U.S. ACTION IN GRENADA

PM171648 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Meeting in Havana; F. Castro's Speech"]

[Text] Fidel Castro, first secretary of the Cuban Communist Party Central Committee and president of the Cuban Councils of State and Ministers, has angrily denounced the criminal U.S. aggression against soveriegn Grenada. He was speaking in Havana at a funeral meeting in memory of the 24 Cubans internationalists who died so heroically in Grenada.

Grenada, F. Castro said in particular, is one of the smallest independent states in terms of both territory and population. If Cuba rendered Grenada a great deal of aid, it did so because our efforts -- quantitatively quite modest but qualitatively very important -- meant a lot to that country. Our doctors, teachers, and other specialists took part in assisting Grenada.

Our people's friendship with Grenada and Prime Minister M. Biship was cordial. Our respect for that country's sovereignty was so irreproachable that we never allowed ourselves even to voice an opinion with regard to what was done in Grenada and how it was done. In our relations with Grenada we were guided by the same principle as in relations with other revolutionary movements -- by absolute respect for its policy, its viewpoint, and the decisions it took. We expressed our opinion on a particular question only if the Grenadians asked us to do so. Imperialism cannot understand that the secret of our excellent relations with the international revolutonary movement consists in only this respect.

The U.S. Government despised Grenada and hated Bishop. It wanted to thwart the process taking place in Grenada and to destroy its achievements, which had served as an example to others. The United States developed plans for a military invasion of the island -- they were exposed two years ago by M. Bishop -- but did not find a suitable pretext for implementing its objectives.

In the years since the victory of the revolution, the speaker pointed out, the economic and social situation on the island has improved markedly, the people have received many benefits, and the GNP has risen -- despite the consequences of the economic crisis. Grenada became a real symbol of independence and progress in the Caribbean.

Today no one can yet say exactly whether dissent was sown in the Grenadian leadership at its own initiative or on instructions from imperialism. It is not out of the question that it was the CIA's doing. Who were the people who prepared the plot against Bishop within the ranks of the party, army, and state security service? Were they a group of extremists infected with theoretical intrigue, or is it simply a case of a group of opportunists with excessive ambitions, or even of enemy agents who wanted to put an end to the revolution in Grenada? Only history will give a definitive answer.

As of 20 October Cuban Communist Party and Government statement pointed out, no crime may be committed in the name of freedom and revolution. To the honor of our own revolution it should be noted that, despite the profound indignation with which we greeted M. Bishop's deposition, we totally refrained from interfering in the Grenadians' internal affairs.

The report that U.S. naval forces were advancing toward Grenada put Cuba in a difficult position. Under these conditions, the speaker noted, there was no pretext on which we could leave Grenada. If imperialism really intended to attack Grenada, our moral duty was to remain there. To leave at that moment would have been dishonorable. It could have promoted the unleashing of aggression -- against Grenada today and against Cuba tomorrow. In addition events were developing with such unbelievable speed that even if we had decided to undertake an evacuation, we would simply not have had the time.

The events within the country could not and cannot serve as a pretext to justify U.S. aggression, F. Castro said. Since when has the United States been the judge in another state's internal conflict? What right did Reagan have to rend his garments in alleged grief at the death of Bishop, whom he so hated and against whom he had struggled? What was the reason for flouting the sovereignty of Grenada -- a small independent state which had achieved recognition and respect throughout the world? It was as though some other country had suddenly declared it had the "right" to invade the United States because of the vile assassination of Martin Luther King or the other numerous crimes against, for instance, the black and Hispanic minorities in the United States, or because John Kennedy was assassinated.

The same can be said of the "argument" that the lives of the Americans in Grenada were in danger. There are far more Americans in dozens of other countries. Does that mean the United States has the right to attack those countries when internal conflicts arise there? Having dismissed the phony stories of the reasons for the U.S. invasion of Grenada, can we regard this policy as the norm in international relations? Even a thousand lectures on scientific communism could not have demonstrated the base, perfidious, aggressive essence of imperialism more graphically than the aggression against Grenada did.

The Reagan administration was flagrantly lying when it tried to justify its invasion by stating that Cuba was responsible for the coup d'etat and Bishop's death, that the U.S. students were in danger of being turned into hostages, that the main aim of the invasion was to protect the lives of U.S. citizens, that the invasion was a "multinational operation" undertaken at the request of former Governor-General Scoon and several East Caribbean countries, that Cuba was planning to invade Grenada and capture it, that Grenada had become "an important Soviet-Cuban base," that the airport under construction was not a civilian but a military one, that the weapons in Grenada were intended for "the export of subversive activity and terrorism," that the Cubans were the first to open fire, that there were over 1,000 Cubans in Grenada, the majority of whom were not construction workers but professional soldiers, that the invasion forces strived to avoid devastation and casualties among the civilian population, that the U.S. troops would stay in Grenada for just one week, that missile launching silos were being installed in Grenada, that the ship the Vietnam Heroico was transporting "special arms," that Cuba had been warned of the invasion, that 500 Cubans were fighting in the mountains, that Cuba has given the order for "reprisals" against the U.S. citizens, and that representatives of the press had not been allowed on the island only for the sake of the "journalists' safety."

Not one of these allegations has been proved, F. Castro stressed: they have all been refuted by the facts. This cynical way of using lies to justify aggression against the tiny country is reminiscent of the methods to which Hitler resorted when he was preparing and unleashing World War II.

Even the U.S. students and employees at the medical college in Grenada admitted that they had been given absolute guarantees of safety and the opportunity to leave the country. Cuba offered the United States its cooperation to reserve any situation which might arise without resorting to violence and invasion.

Not a single U.S. citizen suffered before the invasion of Grenada, and if there was something jeopardizing their lives then it was only the military operation unleashed in Grenada by the Americans. Cuban personnel were instructed not to impede operations to evacuate U.S. citizens from the runway near the university in order to rule out any risk. Reagan's claims that the same thing could happen to Americans in Grenada as happened in Iran, the speaker stressed, were aimed at kindling the Americans' vanity, wounded by these events. It was a demagogic, speculative dishonest statement. Allegations that the airport under construction in Grenada was "a military establishment" are an old lie to which the Reagan administration has frequently resorted, and it has been categorically denied by the British firm which has supplied and installed its electronic equipment there. Specialists from the Plessey firm who worked with Cuban construction workers assert that the latter were simply civilian workers. Several EEC countries belonging to NATO were also taking part in the airport's installation. Could anyone imagine they were cooperating with Cuba and Grenada in installing a military airfield? The allegation that Grenada had become a "Soviet-Cuba military base" is refuted by the fact that not a single Soviet military specialist was to be found there. The allegedly "secret documents" which fell into U.S. hands and were published by the U.S. Government speak of agreement between the Cuban and Grenadian Governments, under which our country sent 27 military advisers, whose number may later have reached 40. These figures coincide fully with the data published in Cuba. Not one of these documents hints at the existence of military bases in Grenada. Nor is there anything to confirm the allegation that the weapons received for the Grenadian Army and militia were designed for export to third countries. This refutes the allegation that Grenada had been turned into an "arsenal" for supplying subversive organizations and terrorists -- as the present head of the U.S. Administration likes to call all national liberation and revolutionary movements.

The allegation that Cuba intended to seize Grenada is so unrealistic, so absurd and insane, so alien to our principles and international policy, that it does not merit any serious attention, F. Castro asserted.

What has actually been proved is Cuba's strictest noninterference in Grenada's internal affairs. The instructions which were sent to our embassy in Grenada and which have been published by the Cuban Government provide incontrovertible proof of the clear-cut and principled position taken by our party and government with regard to events in that tiny island. The fact that our specialists were civilians has been confirmed by the hundreds of foreign journalists who were present when they returned home and had an opportunity to talk with every one of them.

When the U.S. representatives claimed that some 1,000 to 1,500 Cubans were in Grenada at the time of the invasion and that hundreds of them continued to fight in the mountains, Cuba published the exact number of citizens in Grenada at the time of the aggression. There were 784 of them, including diplomats and family members. The instructions they received were also published -- to defend their workplaces and the settlements where they lived in case of attack -- and the impossibility of the claim that hundreds of Cubans were in the mountains was pointed out. The facts have confirmed that the information given by the Cuban side has always corresponded with the truth.

It is just as false and cynical to claim that the Cubans were the first to start hostile actions. It has been incontrovertibly proved that the Cuban workers were asleep at the time of the invasion. They were issued with weapons when the landing on the runway was already at its height, and there were not enough weapons to go around. It is absolutely accurate that fighting began when U.S. troops advanced on the Cubans in combat formation. It is also true that a group of unarmed Cuban specialists was captured by the Americans, who used them as hostages, driving them ahead of U.S. servicemen.

Having cited specific facts in a well argued refutation of other false claims by Reagan, F. Castro emphasized that the seizure of Grenada was carried out suddenly and treacherously without any advance warning at all, in the Pearl Harbor style, in the Nazi style. This invasion, he pointed out, was presented to the American people as a major foreign policy victory for Reagan in the struggle against the socialist camp and the revolutionary movement. All this is linked with the death of 240 U.S. soldiers in Beirut, with the memory of the hostages in Iran, and with the humiliating defeat in Vietnam. The Reagan administration has ignobly and dishonorably played on the patriotism of Americans, on such terms as the country's dignity and the nation's greatness and glory. Hitler behaved in exactly the same way in 1938 when he occupied Austria and Czechoslovakia's Sudetenland.

And where is the glory, the greatness, and the victory -- laurels from the conquest of one of the tiniest countries in the world, a country that lacks the slightest economic or strategic significance? How can it be "heroism" to fight against handfuls of workers and civilian specialists who offered courageous resistance despite the surprise attack and the shortage of ammunition, despite the difference in armaments and numbers? The United States has not scored any victory at all, from either the political, the military, or the moral points of view. From the military point of view, this has been a pyrrhic victory and a profound moral defeat. By flouting all internatinal norms, thus incurring the whole world's hatred and condemnation, the United States has manifested the extent to which it holds the rest of the world in contempt.

This contempt is so great that, as President Reagan has himself declared, events in Grenada have in no way affected his appetite. This is why we must evaluate with all responsibility the real situation and the dangers facing the world. Bearing in mind that the United States possesses the latest means of waging war, both conventional and nuclear, and that the president of such a country can launch a war without consulting anyone: This can be extremely dangerous and tragic for all mankind. The echo of the last shots in Grenada is still reverberating, yet there is already talk about intervention in El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Cuba.

Imperialism is continuing its interference and armed aggression in the Near East and South Africa against progressive countries and national liberation movements.

Deployment is beginning of the first Pershing and cruise missiles out of the 572 which are to be installed in Europe, surrounding the USSR and the other socialist countries with a deadly ring of nuclear facilities capable of reaching their territories in a matter of minutes. It is not just small countries, but all mankind that is in danger. The bell that now tolls for Grenada could toll for all mankind tomorrow. The most prestigious scientists and doctors confirm that man would be unable to survive a nuclear conflict. The destructive power of the stockpiled weapons of this type is a million times greater than the bombs which destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki in a flash. This is what the Reagan administration's militarist and aggressive policy could bring.

The arms race is already a reality at a time when the world is in the grips of its deepest economic crisis since the thirties and it is more imperative than ever to resolve the vital problems of the development of most peoples of the world. No one can trust a government which acts as precipitately, recklessly, and cynically as the incumbent U.S. Administration has done in Grenada. Reagan does not even wish to hear the advice of governments closely linked with him in the political, ideological, and military spheres -- for example, the British Government. It is not surprising that during a public opinion poll, over 90 percent of British people categorically spoke out against the unilateral U.S. prerogative to use the cruise missiles currently being deployed in Britain.

Less than 18 months ago, one of the NATO countries used in our Western Hemisphere modern means of warfare against the Argentinians. The Reagan administration supported these actions, paying no attention at all at the time to the OAS and the treaties and mutual defense pacts, which it discarded with scorn. But now, justifying itself by an invented "request" from some imaginary organization of East Caribbean states, the United States invades Grenada, as a result of which the blood of Grenadians and Cubans is shed.

In Nicaragua, in addition to the 40,000 victims who were the price at which the country's freedom was gained, about 1,000 more have died in battles against the Somozista gangs, which are openly organized and armed by the United States. In El Salvador more than 50,000 people have been exterminated by the inhuman regime, whose army is armed and trained by the United States.

In Guatemala more than 100,000 people have already perished as a result of repressions by the bloody regime which was put in power by the CIA in 1954, when the progressive Arbenz government was overthrown. And how many people have perished in Chile since imperialism plotted the overthrow of the popular unity government and Salvador Allende's assassination! And how many have perished in Uruguay, Paraguay, and other countries over the last 15 years! What a high price in blood, privations, sufferings, and sorrow has been paid by our peoples for imperialism's domination and the existence of the unjust systems imposed by it. The imperialists are trying to destroy the symbols because they know the value of symbols, examples, and ideas, they wanted to destroy them in Grenada, they want to put an end to them in El Salvador, in Nicaragua, and in Cuba. But symbols, examples, and ideas cannot be destroyed, they can only multiply. Grenada has already augmented the patriotic confidence and combat spirit of Salvadoran revolutionaries, Nicaraguans, and Cubans. Grenada has proved that it is possible to fight the elite imperialist troops without fearing them. The imperialists must know that they will encounter resolute resistance each time they attempt to carry out aggression against any revolutionary people. Let the pyrrhic victory in Grenada not intoxicate them nor lead to new and irretrievable mistakes.

In Nicaragua the United States will run up against a highly patriotic and revolutionary people -- united, organized, militant, and armed -- whom it will never be possible to subjugate. As for Cuba, if in Grenada the United States had to use an elite division to fight against handfuls of people surrounded in unfortified positions thousands of kilometers away from home, how many divisions will it need against millions of fighters defending their homeland and their people! Our country, as we have repeatedly said, may be wiped off the face of the earth, but it will never be conquered and subdued! -- F. Castro declared in conclusion.

After the end of the meeting, to the sound of the funeral march, the cortege of gun carriages bearing the remains of the Cubans who fell in Grenada, covered by Cuban national flags, made its way to the capital's Colon Cemetery, where they were buried in the pantheon of Cuba's Revolutionary Armed Forces. Over 1 million residents of the capital and of Havana Province paid their last respects to the internationalist heroes.

U.S. PREPARING 'NEW ADVENTURE' IN NICARAGUA

PM171534 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Nov 83 First Edition p 5

[Vadim Listov "Commentator's Column": "Storm Clouds Over Nicaragua"]

[Text] Disturbing news is coming from Central America. There is a great deal to indicate that the Pentagon is preparing a new military adventure. This time the center of gravity of the operations to "save democracy" is being shifted from Grenada to revolutionary Nicaragua.

Yet another sign indicating that preparations for aggression against that country have entered a new phase has emerged in recent days. That is the role which Washington is assigning in its schemes to Nicaragua's southern neighbor, Costa Rica. Curtin Winsor, U.S. ambassador in San Jose, has officially declared that about 1,000 American soldiers will soon be arriving in Costa Rica in order to... "build roads" in the region bordering Nicaragua. This decision is the result of the pressure applied by U.S. Under Secretary of Defense Fred Ikle when he was in San Jose recently. But the backdrop to it is provided by the crude pressure exerted on Costa Rica by the IMF, which has demanded that the "screws be tightened" inside the country. Washington's unceremonious actions have caused a crisis in the Costa Rican government: Foreign Minister Volio Jimenez has resigned as a mark of protest to the increased U.S. military presence and anti-Nicaraguan activity.

Pressure on Nicaragua's northern borders is also being stepped up. On the pretext of holding the Big Pine-2 military maneuvers, another 5,000 Marines are being dispatched to Honduras to swell the 6,000 American soldiers already there, and helicopters, tanks, armored personnel carriers, and supplies are being hurriedly unloaded from American ships. A report appeared on the imminent dispatch of American troops to El Salvador. And all this does not include the 25,000 military servicemen on board U.S. warships constantly cruising off the coasts of Central America. Summarizing the Pentagon's military preparations, THE LOS ANGELES TIMES notes with alarm that the United States is becoming involved in a "bloody and protracted conflict...."

A special "strike" role is being assigned to the Somozist mercenaries and the so-called "inter-American peace force" -- which will be based on American troops. The calculation being made by Pentagon strategists is simple: American soldiers must "neutralize" the patriotic forces' actions in El Salvador, seal off the frontier in Costa Rica, and thus isolate Nicaragua from the south, secure the counterrevolutionary gangs' rear in Honduras, and then, as soon as the latter appeal to the United States for "assistance," immediately begin an intervention similar to that carried out against Grenada.

It is the duty of the peace-loving forces to prevent a new Grenada!

IZVESTIYA RECALLS ASSASSINATION ATTEMPT ON LENIN

PM171216 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Nov 83 Morning Edition p 3

[Nikolay Khokhlov book review under the rubric "Books": "Immortal"]

[Text] What people have begun to call Leniniana covers a vast range: The image of the leader of Great October is reflected in novels and stories, in poetry, essays, and tales, in music, on canvas, in sculpture, and in the movies. The documentary form occupies a special place amid this multiplicity of materials and genres, and is highly prized not only by experts, historians, and philosophers, but also by the broadest circles of the Soviet reading public. And this, I think, is the merit of the recently published book "A Bullet in the Heart of the Revolution" (Footnote) ("A Bullet in the Heart of the Revolution" ["Yystrel V Serdtse Revolyutsii"], Moscow, Political Literature Publishing House, 1983.

The book is written in a strictly documentary style throughout, as most befits its content: It is a detailed account of the villainous attempt on V.I. Lenin's life on 30 August 1918 -- 65 years ago. It was on that Friday evening that the Socialist Revolutionary Fanny Roid-Kaplan, whose parents had settled in America, fired three shots at V.I. Lenin as he was leaving a workers' rally at the Mikhelson Plant in Moscow. At that time he was making frequent speeches to all manner of audiences.

The account of these dramatic events is preceded by a documentary account of two unsuccessful attempts on Vladimir Ilich's life in January and March 1918; the third could have been fatal.

The general situation in the country was unbelievably difficult, and V.I. Lenin said about it: "...we are living through the hardest and most trying period of the transition from capitalism to socialism." He pointed out the danger for Soviet power posed by the international counterrevolution and the foreign intervention. It was the more than eventful year of 1918; the revolution was less than a year old. Everything was still just settling down, things were just coming into being.

The terrorist actions in Moscow and Petersburg showed that a counterrevolutionary anti-Soviet underground, composed of the most active Socialist Revolutionaries, existed and was active in the country. "You see, the Socialist Revolutionaries are becoming conspirators against Soviet power," Vladimir Ilich told Bolshevik A. Arosev. "They will simply shoot us!..."

It can be said that here we stand at the very source of the question of terror and of the attitude of the Bolshevik party and the organs of Soviet power toward it. V.I. Lenin noted that there was no question of terror after the accomplishment of the revolution. "We freed," he wrote, "not only many of Kerenskiy's ministers, but even Krasnov, who had been fighting against us." Our revolution was forced to unsheathe the sword of punishment to defend its historic gains only in response to the mass terror by October's sworn enemies.

The materials relating to the terrorist acts by the White Socialist Revolutionaries are highly topical even today: Our ideological enemies in the contemporarty international situation frequently resort to slanderous accusations against communists in different countries concerning their alleged "complicity" in some terrorist escapade or other. But it was, after all, V.I. Lenin himself who described the assassination of German Ambassador Count Mirbach as "a criminal terrorist act" and angrily wrote of the "criminal tactics of the left-wing Socialist Revolutionary adventurists." This is the truth about the attitude toward terror, displayed by the communists, who were themselves its victims.

One of the authors of recollections about Ilich notes the most typical trait of his nature: not a trace of bravado. Not ever, or in anything. Always straightforward in everything. And at the meeting in the former Mikhelson Plant's grenade shop, having dwelt on the accusation that the Bolsheviks had deviated from the slogans of equality and fraternity, he spoke a phrase that was typical of him: "Let's be frank about this matter."

Only thus, in the Leninist fashion -- frankly. And he took his revolutionary truth of his, the truth about the transformation of Russia that was in progress and the uncompromising struggle for it, among the people. The comrades surrounding him, who were concerned about him and protected him in all possible ways, could only mutter, stricken with grief, that Ilich again "did not listen."

The book contains quite a few authentic facts and examples illustrating Lenin's character -- rich, generous, expansive, and purposeful in his discipline. V.I. Lenin was also a physically strong man capable of bravely bearing the sufferings that befell him. The eyewitness stories, which cannot be read without tense attention and emotion, contain details painting the picture of V.I. Lenin under exceptional circumstances. Gravely wounded, he fell by the footboard of the automobile in which he was to have traveled. By himself, as S. Gil testifies, he took a few steps to the vehicle and sat in the rear seat, in his usual place. On the way they noticed that the blood flow was increasing. They found a piece of twine and wound it round his left arm above the wound. Once at the Kremlin, in front of his apartment, he curtly refused assistance, saying: "I'll walk by myself..." Leaning on those accompanying him, he climbed the steep stairs to the third floor, reached the bedroom, and started undressing himself....

N.K. Krupskaya recalled: "I entered our bedroom. Ilich's bed had been moved into the center of the room, and he was lying in it pale, all the blood drained from his face. He saw me and whispered a minute later: 'You have come, but you look tired. Go and lie down.' He turned to Lunacharskiy, who was standing by the bed and said: 'Well, what is there to look at.'"

The doctors expressed "their extreme amazement at the endurance and patience, of Vladimir Ilich, who did not make the slightest sound even when submitting to the terribly painful dressing of the wound." It is to be supposed that when the doctors treating him, literally a few hours after the assassination attempt, confidently said that Ilich has a strong constitution, that Ilich will live. This was said not for the sake of a white lie -- fully permissible, not to be condemned, and salutary in such cases -- but really with profound conviction and on the basis of observation of the wounded man's reaction.

KRASNAYA GAZETA wrote in its 12 September 1918 issue: "Comrade Lenin's health is entirely satisfactory. Comrade Lenin has been allowed to sit up and read. The patient is fully abreast of all political news.... He is joking a great deal with those around him and is confident that he will be out of bed in the next few days." Several days later, asked how he felt, Vladimir Ilich answered: "Couldn't be better. Time for work!..."

We see V.I. Lenin, now clearly on the mend: Instructions, telegrams, and notes started flowing from the Kremlin apartment to various institutions, and he even started receiving "local people" who had come from the depths of Russia. This is how V. Desnitskiy describes Lenin's hospitality:

"He insisted on treating us:

"'Eat some cheese, fresh, soft bread. Eat some cherries, they have just been bought and washed...'"

"The feast was very modest. The hospitable host did not know that he did not have any tea, and I quietly went to the office where I got from one of the employees, an old acquaintance of mine from Nizhgorod, some tea for the chairman of the Soviet of People's Commissars."

Invaluable testimonies: They can be placed without hesitation right next to the works created by artists -- they are just as emotional and highly significant, they give just as much food for thought, and they truthfully recreate the atmosphere of the unforgettable days, the atmosphere of that time as a whole. A real golden and unfading treasury of Leniniana. Here is Vladimir Ilich asking a favor of the RSFSR people's commissar for health: "I promised V.N. Rozanov (surgeon at the Soldatenkovskaya, now the S.P. Botkin, Hospital -- N.K.) to help medical assistant Grezhnova, who looked after me following the operation to extract the bullet.

"Rozanov is asking that she, together with the orphan girl that she is looking after, be given further leave this summer."

Does not order, but asks a favor -- and how! It cannot be denied, not only because Lenin himself is pleading, but because the request is convincing, based upon sympathy for the orphan girl who has no one to stay with if the woman who has taken on the duty of bringing her up goes on vacation alone. A deeply popular and very weighty argument: Who in our country would dare refuse an orphan?

...Affairs at the front were improving: The Red Army was liberating city after city, sweeping all the homegrown and foreign scum out of the terriroty of the agitated country. Vladimir Ilich's rejoinder to the telegraph operator: "Such news deserves a kiss...." He cabled the Penza Provincial Executive Committee and the 1st Army Revolutionary Military Soviet: "The taking of Simbirsk, my home town, is the most salutary and the best dressing for my wound. I feel an unprecedented surge of energy and strength."

The personal aspect creeps into a strictly official document -- and how inspiring this personal aspect is! Through these amazing words you can just see the Red Army men to whom Lenin's cable was read, their inspired faces, their determination to march into the last and decisive battle for the glory of their won Soviet power.

On the very same day, 30 August 1918, Ya. Sverdlov, chairman of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, addressed an appeal to all the soviets of workers, peasants, and Red Army deputies , to all armies -- "to all, to all, to all" -- which said: "Calm and organization! All must stand firmly at their posts! Close ranks!"

The materials in the book convincingly confirm that the disgusting attempt on Vladimir Ilich's life did not cause confusion among the ranks of the people, who under the Bolshevik party's leadership, had accomplished the greatest revolution in history.

The founder of the Soviet state recovered together with Russia -- a dual joy for the people, who sent Ilich alarmed enquiries and best wishes to see him again energetic, healthy, and able to work, seeing this as a reliable guarantee that our Soviet victory holiday will be, will inevitably be, celebrated in the wide Soviet street!

Returning us to the past, the book of Lenin documents gives today's Soviet man, builder and working person, strength and confidence and teaches him how, with what courage and coolness, to overcome the most difficult twists along the path of building the new society.

COMPARISON OF ROY MEDVEDEV ON ANDROPOV

The item entitled "Andropov's Achievements in First Year Reviewed," which begins on page R 5 of the 14 November Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, has been compared with a Rome LA REPUBBLICA Italian version published on 12 November, presented as having been "written especially for LA REPUBBLICA." The following variations were revealed:

Page R 5, between the first and second paragraphs, LA REPUBBLICA adds: "Andropov inherited a bad legacy from his predecessor. In Brezhnev's final years the Soviet Union was in a situation of economic, political, and moral crisis -- a crisis that involved foreign policy, too. Of course the main symptoms of a crisis are very different in Western and Eastern bloc countries. But that does not make our crises any less serious and painful for the people.

"One must certainly not underestimate the major step forward made by the Soviet economy in the past 20 years. Industrial gross product has increased over fourfold in this period. Soviet citizens have begun to live much better than in the previous decade. But recently production growth rates had slowed down considerably. There was an increasingly apparent emergence of difficulties that could not yet be called "growth difficulties." Everywhere economic indices were deteriorating, and the inadequacy of the labor force was apparent. Inflation was spreading, unsatisfied demand was growing, and shortages of essential goods and many other goods were increasing. Work rates were extremely slow in the construction sector, whose costs greatly exceeded forecasts. Growing military spending constituted a serious obstacle to economic development. The gulf between the USSR and the Western countries was unaltered, as far as levels of technology and labor organization were concerned.

"Having almost entirely exhausted the principal factors of extensive development, the USSR was unable quickly and efficiently to introduce the factors of intensive development. Though industrial output was advancing, albeit slowly, agricultural output was at a standstill. For 4 consecutive years there were bad harvests. The shelves of city stores were more and more empty, and in the majority of provincial cities, for the first time since the war, it was necessary to introduce a food rationing system. The huge funds allocated in the first 5 years to agricultural development had the sole result of raising agricultural production costs. Several billion dollars, which could have permitted the purchase of modern techniques and technology, were being spent on the purchase of foodstuffs from Western countries.

"Only the vast natural resources, the monopoly on foreign trade that defended the domestic market, centralized management, and state ownership that enabled the worst enterprises to compensate for their failures via the better results of more efficient enterprises spared the Soviet Union an even more profound economic crisis."
(adding passage)

Between the second and third paragraphs LA REPUBBLICA adds:

"Furthermore, the majority of those surrounding him were more concerned with supporting and distracting [distrarre] the man than with carefully removing him from the bridge.

"The absence of due order in the higher spheres of power was reflected at all levels of public administration, which became more and more formal and bureaucratic. Written reports and decisions took the place of specific acts."

"Soviet citizens quipped bitterly: 'Instead of the abundance of foodstuffs promised to the citizens by the party in 1980, they gave us the "Food Program."' But we certainly cannot feed our children on "press clippings"' (the Russian word also means "fillets" -- LA REPUBBLICA editor's note). Discipline and order were nonexistent in the workers' places of work, in the enterprises' offices, and in the offices of agencies and ministries. Of course, there were exceptions within this regrettable framework, but they did not determine the general style of management of the country and the economy.

"Together with negligence, the scale of the abuses committed also increased. Corruption, which was spreading higher and higher, was becoming a serious illness. Several abuses of power were shown to implicate persons very close to Brezhnev, who tolerated them very indulgently. The incomes, privileges, and the general living standards of those responsible for state and party management rose during the Brezhnev period more than those of all other strata of the population. In many republics and oblasts and in the institutions local cliques sprang up that tended to regard their spheres of responsibility or the sectors under their management almost as private property. This list of defects and social shortcomings in management could continue for pages and pages.

"Despite the vast number of doctors, the quality of health services steadily declined. The public education system was becoming antiquated and no longer met the country's needs. The vast network of scientific institutes was not yielding the proper results. The functioning of transport declined. For the first time in the entire history of the Soviet Government average life expectancy began to fall and the mortality rate, including the infant mortality rate, began to rise. In the country's cultural life mediocrity, banality, and again nepotism reigned. Growing impatience with the country's conditions gave rise to various forms of protest and criticism, to which the Brezhnev regime responded, on the one hand, with repression, and on the other hand, by intensifying the absurd glorification of Brezhnev himself. Even the USSR's international position deteriorated. Of course, it must be pointed out that in the first half of the seventies the Brezhnev leadership did succeed in extricating the USSR from international isolation, which had reached critical forms following the intervention in Czechoslovakia and the harsh clashes on the Soviet-Chinese border.

"The apex of success in foreign policy was the 1975 Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The Final Act of that conference was ratified by 33 European countries, the United States, and Canada.

"If Brezhnev had left the country's leadership in 1976, following the sudden worsening of his state of health, or at least in 1979, having signed in Vienna what seemed to be a happily concluded accord -- SALT II --we would now remember him with different feelings, as an architect of detente, whose results were, for various reasons, almost completely lost betwen 1980 and 1982. It is not surprising, therefore, that Brezhnev's death on 10 November 1982 prompted more expectancy and hope in Soviet citizens than sadness and anxiety." (adding passage)

Page R 6, after the sixth paragraph, LA REPUBBLICA reads: "What prevents the implementation of a more resolute change? Both society and the economy have become much more complex, and it is important to deliberate carefully on every change. Furthermore, changes cannot be the same in every region of our vast country."

"In the economy, for instance, it is a matter not so much of formulating new management systems, concerning which much has already been proposed, as of a transition from the old to the new systems. A large proportion of social ailments have now become chronic and society has adapted to them. Overly sudden remedial methods imply risks that the new leadership would like to reduce to a minimum. It is already more difficult to restore a building than to reconstruct it completely with more modern materials. Furthermore, the old administration, most of which remains, is not inclined to accept changes and impedes the rise to the forefront of new younger and energetic leaders. Even Khrushchev tried to weaken the bureaucratic system that had come about. Unfortunately, however, not only did he not succeed in doing so, but to some extent he actually improved it. Brezhnev was a product of this system, which under him acquired unprecedented power. It cannot be substantially changed by acting solely 'from the top,' that is, with the help of actual bureaucratic methods.

"So in the past 12 months in the Soviet Union there has been no revolution. But there have been changes, and one cannot fail to notice them. There have been changes for the better in the economy. In 1981 industrial output in the USSR rose 3.5 percent; in 1982 it rose only 2.8 percent. According to initial figures, the growth of industrial output in 1983 will be above 4 percent, while labor productivity will increase 3.5 percent.

"A number of important decision have also been taken to improve city services, to improve agricultural mechanization, and to strengthen the entire agricultural machine-building sector. With the aim of formulating more major reforms it has been decided to conduct a number of large-scale experiments envisaging, for instance, an extension of the rights of certain enterprises and industrial associations. This issue was raised some time ago, at which time Kosygin concerned himself with its solution within the context of the unsuccessful 1965 economic reform. The restriction of enterprises' and associations' rights is the main constraint on the development of initiative, enterprise, autonomy, and ultimately progress in production. It is known that the new law on labor collectives and on the enhancement of their role in the management of enterprises, institutes and organizations, introduced in summer 1983, is intended to "work" in precisely this direction. Measures have also been adopted to strengthen economic relations between industry and agriculture and to facilitate a more rapid application of scientific discoveries to the national economy.

"Many of the..." (picking up page R 7 paragraph two, supplying variant passage)

AFP: DISSIDENT MATHEMATICIAN ARRESTED BY KGB

NC172240 Paris AFP in English 2217 GMT 17 Nov 83

[Text] Moscow, Nov 17 (AFP) -- Dissident Soviet mathematician Yuriy Shikhanovich has been arrested by the Soviet secret service, the KGB, on charges of "anti-Soviet propaganda," leading dissident Yelana Bonner told Western newsmen here today.

Mrs Bonner, wife of Nobel Peace Prize winner Andrey Sakharov, did not say when the arrest was made.

She said the 50-year-old scientist was held after a series of raids here by the KGB.

Mrs Bonner added that dissidents Boris Altshuller and Mariya Podyapolskaya, whose homes were also searched by the KGB, would be questioned tomorrow by authorities.

EARLY NOV REPUBLIC LEADER ACTIVITIES REPORTED

FM171018 [Editorial Report] Soviet Russian-language regional newspapers for early November 1983 carry the following reports on leader activities:

Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA 6 November frontpages a 500-word KAZTAG report entitled "Ceremonial Meeting in Alma-Ata" which notes the presence of D.A. Kunayev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee, at a "ceremonial meeting of representatives of Alma-Ata's working people" in Alma-Ata on 5 November to mark the 66th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The report notes that Kunayev was "in the presidium."

Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA 6 November frontpages a 50-word GRUZINFORM report entitled "Lecture-Seminar Study at the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee" which notes that the work of the seminar, held on 3 November, was "conducted by E.A. Shevardnadze, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee."

The same issue of ZARYA VOSTOKA frontpages a 400-word GRUZINFORM report entitled "Along Lenin's Path, Following the Road of Peace and Creation," which notes the presence of E.A. Shevardnadze in the presidium of a "ceremonial meeting of the Tbilisi City Soviet and representatives of the city's party and social organizations and military units of the Tbilisi garrison" on 5 November to mark the 66th anniversary of the October Revolution.

The same issue of ZARYA VOSTOKA front-pages a 450-word GRUZINFORM report entitled "How Is Demand To Be Satisfied?" on a visit on an unspecified date by E.A. Shevardnadze, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, to the Georgian Republic center for the organization of work to satisfy the population's demand for consumer goods, which was set up at the Georgian SSR Exhibition of National Economic Achievements on 30 March last.

After noting that a "talk was held on the future activity, tasks, and functions of the newly created republic center," the report concludes as follows:

"Comrade E.A. Shevardnadze approved the work of the thematic display and the center. He gave recommendations regarding the production of sports goods to enterprises in light, local, and other sectors of industry and recommendations regarding the broad use of the relevant services and institutes in studying the market and demand.

"The need was indicated to increase the satisfaction of the population's demand in light of the prevailing state of money circulation and to improve the population's level of information by means of well conceived advertising.

"Particular attention was paid to the need to enhance the Gosplan's role and responsibility in the solution of a task of such importance to the state as satisfying the population's demand for consumer goods."

ZARYA VOSTOKA 7 November frontpages a 1,000-word GRUZINFORM report entitled "Tbilisi Reports Back With New Construction Projects," which notes that "Comrade E.A. Shevardnadze" was among a number of Georgian officials who visited construction projects in Tbilisi on 6 November. The report describes achievements in construction but concludes by noting that "during the visit the republic leaders talked with inhabitants of the city, with occupants of new housing, with construction workers, and with trade and production workers."

"While assessing the work that had been done on its merits, they also expressed a number of criticisms. Specific instructions were given and tasks set for further improving working, study, and everyday living conditions in Tbilisi."

ZARYA VOSTOKA on 10 November frontpages a 700-word GRUZINFORM report entitled "Construction Projects at the Kutaisi Truck Plant Must Be on Time!" on a routine extramural session of the working group for increasing the efficiency of the development of sectors and industries in the republic's economy. The report notes that the session, held presumably in Kutaisi but on an unspecified date, included speeches by V.N. Polyakov, USSR minister of the automotive industry, and by Georgian party officials. The report also notes that E.A. Shevardnadze, "candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, heads the working group."

SHCHERBITSKIY PAYS LAST RESPECTS TO FUNCTIONARY

AU101252 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 2 Nov 83 p 3

[Excerpts] Ratau -- On 1 November, the working people of Kiev, in deep sorrow, paid their last repsects to Sergey Bladimirovich Gusovskiy, general director of the Arsenal Plant Production Association, deputy to the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, member of Kiev Gorkom, Hero of Socialist Labor, and recipient of the Lenin and the USSR State Prizes.

The hall of the Culture House of the V.I. Lenin Arsenal Plant was mournfully decorated. The coffin with the body of the deceased was placed among flowers on a catafalque.

In the last moments of leave-taking, the honor guard was taken by V.V. Shcherbitskiy, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary; A.F. Vatchencko, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo member and Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman; Yu.N. Yelchenko, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo member and Kiev Gorkom first secretary; V.M. Tsybulko, Kiev Obkom first secretary; V.D. Kryuchkov, department chief in the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee; academician B.Ye. Paton, president of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences; and bureau members of Kiev Gorkom and Obkom.

EARLY NOVEMBER WEATHER, CROP STATUS REPORTED

PM151526 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 15 Nov 83 p 1

[Agrometeorologist O. Pisarenko report: "Weather and Crops"]

[Text] It has become sharply colder in recent days in the country's European territory. But before this, in the first 10 days of November, it was warm. Winter crops were even growing by day. In the Northern, Volga-Vyatka, Rals, and Central zones, in the east of the Northwestern region, and in the north of the Central Chernozem and Volga regions they are mostly at the tilling stage. Vegetation ended 10-15 days later then usual.

In the Baltic republics, most of Belorussia, and the west Ukraine, winter grain crops had thickened out: 2-3 shoots had formed on each plant. In central, eastern, and southern regions of the Ukraine early winter sowings had thickened out, whereas the later crops were at the seedling and third leaf stage.

In farming regions of West Siberia and North Kazakhstan the warmest days were the first days of the 10-day period, when the maximum air temperature reached 4-10 degrees in most regions and 11-14 degrees in Altay Kray and Kemerovo, Karaganda, Semipalatinsk, and East Kazakhstan Oblasts, the mimimum falling to 13-22 degrees of frost. Snow cover became established at the end of the 10-day period. Conditions for the start of winter crop wintering are good. The minimum soil temperature at tilling node depth was from 3 to 5 degrees of frost.

At the beginning of the 10-day period there was warm weather in the Central Asian republics. Maximum air temperature reached 23-20 degrees, but from 3 November the weather grew colder in most regions. Good conditions for harvesting the cotton remained only in the Kara-Kalpak ASSR, Khorezm, Tashauz, Andizhan, Surkhan-Darya, and Kurgan-Tyube Oblasts, and the Fergana valley. In the remaining Central Asian regions sown to cotton, harvesting conditions deteriorated owing to a sharp drop in air temperature and a significant amount of precipitation (up to 35 mm). In the last days of the 10-day period the air temperature rose. This somewhat improved harvesting conditions.

TASS REPORTS 17 NOV LAUNCH OF COSMOS-1509

LD171619 Moscow TASS in English 1614 GMT 17 Nov 83

[Text] Moscow November 17 TASS -- The artificial earth satellite "Cosmos-1509" was launched in the Soviet Union today.

The satellite carries scientific equipment designed to continue the programme of space exploration.

The satellite has the initial period of revolution of 89.3 minutes; the maximum distance from the surface of the earth -- 309 kilometers; the minimum -- 209 kilometers; the inclination of the orbit -- 72.9 degrees.

The equipment aboard the satellite is functioning normally.

PROGRESS-18 'CEASED TO EXIST' OVER PACIFIC

LD161132 Moscow TASS in English 1104 GMT 16 Nov 83

[Text] Moscow November 16 TASS -- A TASS special correspondent reports from the mission control centre:

The flight of the automatic cargo spacecraft "Progress-18" which was put into a near-earth orbit on October 20, 1983, ended today.

On commands from the control centre the cargo spacecraft was oriented in space and is propulsion unit was ignited at seven hours 18 minutes, Moscow time. As a result of deceleration the "Progress-18" spacecraft moved on to a descent path, entered dense layers of the atmosphere over a pre-set area of the Pacific Ocean and ceased to exist.

Cosmonauts Vladimir Lyakhov and Aleksandr Aleksandrov continue working on board the "Salyut-7"-"Soyuz T-9" research complex.

The crew's flight programme in the past two days included geophysical research, the practicing of methods of recording technological processes with the use of a set of holographic apparatus, and training sessions in the pneumo-vacuum space suit "Chibis".

Today's schedule envisages technical and biological experiments, routine maintenance on board the station, and physical exercises.

According to telemetric data and crew reports, the flight of the "Salyut-7"-"Soyuz T-9" orbital complex is proceeding normally.

The state of Lyakhov's and Aleksandrov's health is good and they are feeling well.

MAIN POLITICAL DIRECTORATE MEETS ON PARTY ACTIVITIES

PM151558 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Nov 83 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "At the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; flagging Attention to Leadership of Party Organs' Reports and Elections"]

[Text] The Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate has examined the question of leadership of reports and elections in primary party organiztions and the holding of party conferences. A report was delivered on the matter by Colonel General P. Gorchakov, member of the Military Council and chief of the Political Directorate of the Strategic Rocket Forces. A discussion ensued. It was summed up by Army General A. Yepishev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate.

In the course of the examination it was noted that the report and election meetings in party groups and in shop and primary party organizations have been well organized, with Communists displaying a businesslike and vigorous approach. They are demonstrating Communists' unity and cohesion around the CPSU Central Committee, their unanimous approval of the party's domestic and foreign policy, and deep understanding of the tasks arising out of the Statement by Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. The Communists of the Army and Navy are responding to imperialism's aggressive intrigues by increasing their readiness to defend the motherland and the cause of socialism.

Most of the meetings are comprehensively analyzing party organizations' organizational and ideological work in the fulfillment of the tasks put forward in the decisions of the 26th party congress and subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums and in orders and directives of the USSR Defense Ministry, and are examining from the viewpoint of the heightened demands questions relating to the further improvement of the quality and efficiency of party work on maintaining high combat readiness and vigilance on combat duty and the fulfillment of training plans and socialist pledges. The principled approach to the examination of these matters has helped to increase communists' responsibility for the successful completion of the training year.

In effecting the leadership of reports and elections, the Political Directorate and political organs of the Rocket Forces are monitoring the preparation and holding of party meetings and ensuring the participation of leading personnel. Special attention is being paid to the party organiztions of units tackling the most crucial tasks and also of the subunits where ommissions in training and discipline have been observed. Steps were taken with a point of improving the qualitative makeup of party organization secretaries. The Political Directorate is comprehensively analyzing political organs' work in connection with preparations for party conferences.

At the same, it was noted that in a number of cases meetings have failed to adequately analyze the party work experience accumulated since the 26th CPSU Congress and the effectiveness of party influence on fundamental questions of the life and training of units and subunits and the developments of socialist competition. Sometimes there is a failure to provide a principled assessment of each Communist's contribution to improving combat readiness, ensuring vigilant combat duty, fulfilling combat and political training plans, and mastering weapons and combat equipment.

In some cases reports and elections fail to thoroughly examine questions related to the fulfillment of the decisions of the June (1983) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee on the improvement of ideological and mass political work as part and parcel of the organization of personnel training and education. The discussion of party committees' and party bureaus' activity in enhancing the ideological tempering of CPSU members and candidate members and their influence on the moral atmosphere of military collectives sometimes lacks the requisite edge. A number of meetings have failed to properly reveal the effectiveness of the steps being taken to strengthen party, state and military discipline, and they have not properly covered questions pertaining to intraparty life, especially in regards to the fulfillment of the decisions of the 6th All-Army Conference of Primary Party Organization Secretaries on increasing the initiative, activeness, and principle of party work, ensuring a vanguard role for Communists, and improving the monitoring and verification of the implementation of party decisions and party leadership of the Komsomol.

It was stressed that some political organs sometimes fail to promptly focus the attention of the party committees and party bureaus on the comprehensive preparation of each report meeting and the enhancement of their representatives' role in this. Sometimes the generalization of the questions raised and suggestions made at meetings is too sluggish. Preparations for the forthcoming party conferences are slow to get under way in a number of formations.

The Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate drew the attention of the Rocket Forces Political Directorate and all Army and Navy political organs to the job of ensuring the consistent fulfillment of the CPSU Central Committee resolutions on holding report and election meetings in party organiztions. It recommended a comprehensive analysis of the results of the party report and election meetings and the adoption of the requisite measures to eliminate existing shortcomings and ensure the careful preparation of the forthcoming party meetings and conferences. In the present situation it is important to assess objectively the effectiveness of party influence on the further enhancement of vigilance; the successful solutions of tasks relating to combat readiness, combat duty, and the quality of combat and political training; and the strengthening of military discipline, and to determine measures for the fulfillment of the USSR Defense Ministry's demands for the new training year.

Special attention must be paid to examining the activity of political organs and party committees and bureas in improving ideological work as an integral part of life, combat training, and service in accordance with the guidelines of the June (1983) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, which stressed that ideological work is a matter for the whole party and every communist.

In the course of party conferences it is necessary to comprehensively analyze both the political organs' implementation of the 26th CPSU Congress instructions in improving methods of party leadership and enhancing the role of primary party organizations as the political nucleus of military collectives, and the fulfillment of the recommendations at the 6th All-Army Conference of Primary Party Organization Secretaries on focusing efforts on organiztional activity directly in the military and labor collectives and on improving the party leadership of Komsomol organizations. Reports, election meetings and conferences at headquarters and organs of control should focus attention on questions relating to increasing the activeness and responsibility of apparatus communists for organizational work among the forces and carefully examine and fundamentally assess the fulfillment of the party's instructions on the selection, placement, and education of cadres and the monitoring and verification of the implementation of decisions.

In view of the fact that the main reports and the accountability reports of the party commissions are discussed separately at party conferences, every effort must be made to ensure that party commissions' activity is analyzed from the viewpont of the heightened demands concerning the purity of party ranks and the enhancement of Communists' responsibility for carrying out the CPSU rules and observing party, state, and military discipline.

Political organs should display constant concern for molding the elected party aktiv, strengthening its qualitative composition, ensuring that party organization secretaries get their instructions promptly, and giving them practical help at local level. It is necessary to ensure the prompt generalization of critical remarks and suggestions by Communists at meetings and conferences, the careful consideration of them by military councils, commanders, and political organs, and the notification of Communists regarding their implementation.

Political organs must have close businesslike contacts with local party committees and they must ensure the timely solution of questions connected with the participation of Army and Navy Communists in local party conferences.

Fuller use should be made of the preparation and holding of party report and election meetings and party conferences to mobilize Communists and the entire personnel to embark upon the new training year in a well organized manner and to ensure the high-quality fulfillment of the tasks which the party has set the USSR Armed Forces relating to the defense of the gains of socialism.